

HEATHER ALTMAN

P-1-1

The comment is the e-mail transmittal for the comment letter and does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005; therefore, no further response is necessary.

P-1-2

The comment consists of an introduction to the comment letter and the commentator and does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005; therefore, no further response is necessary.

P-1-3

This comment states that citation and reference correlation are inadequate in DEIR 2005. The citations provided in DEIR 2005 correlate to citations used in Appendix B of DEIR 2005 (Air Quality Analysis). Citations in DEIR 2005 will be revised to reference "LSA Associates, Inc. 2005. Air Quality Analysis" or "LSA Associates, Inc. 2005. Traffic Impact Analysis." Clarifications will also be made to the Chapter 11, References, to include citations made in the Chapter 4.0 of DEIR 2005 and to Appendix B, Air Quality Analysis, to accurately reflect materials cited in the text of that document. These changes are clarifications and refinements to the text; only references that were included as citations in Chapter 4.0 or Appendix B will be added. No new citations will be added. These changes to the EIR do not result in a significant impact and have no material effect on the findings of the EIR.

P-1-4

This comment states that the Traffic Impact Analysis does not mention CO hot spot modeling analysis. As stated on page 4.2-12 of DEIR 2005, localized air quality impacts (i.e., CO concentrations [CO hot spots]) in the project area would be affected by the increased traffic flow due to the proposed project. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) CALINE4 model was used to assess the project's impacts on local CO concentrations. Vehicle trips attributed to the proposed project are used in the model. The reference provided on page 4.2-15 indicates that trip generation rates derived in the TIA for the project were used in the CO hot spot analysis. Please note that updated air quality/CO concentration information was included in the Recirculated Draft EIR, which was made available for public review on June 2, 2006.

P-1-5

Please refer to Response to Comment P-1-3.

P-1-6

Please refer to Responses to Comments P-1-3 and P-1-7.

P-1-7

This comment states that DEIR 2005 references were not provided per the CEQA Guidelines. The Notice of Availability (NOA) for DEIR 2005 and page 2-1 of the Introduction to DEIR 2005 indicated that all questions regarding the preparation of the document and the City review of the proposed document should be referred to Angela Reynolds, Community and Environmental Planning Officer.

The State CEQA Guidelines set forth three methods that may be used to incorporate data from other sources in the EIR:

1. Use of an EIR appendix (14 Cal Code Regs §15148)
2. Citation to technical information (14 Cal Code Regs §15148)
3. Incorporation by reference (14 Cal Code Regs §15150)

Information included in an EIR Appendix may include summarized technical data, maps, plot plans, diagrams, and similar information in sufficient detail to permit the public and reviewing agencies to make a full assessment of significant environmental effects of the project. To achieve a balance between the technical accuracy of an EIR and its public information function, the State CEQA Guidelines provide that placement of high technical analysis and data in the body of an EIR should be avoided by including supporting information and analysis in appendices to the EIR. Appendices may be prepared in volumes separate from the body of the EIR but must be readily available for public examination.

Source documents, such as background information and technical information that is not project specific, may be cited in the EIR. To keep EIRs to a manageable length, source documents used in preparing an EIR need not be included in the EIR or EIR Appendices.

An EIR may also incorporate by reference all or a portion(s) of another document that is a matter of public record or is generally available to the public. Incorporation is a procedure for reducing the size of an EIR and is particularly appropriate for long, descriptive, or technical materials that provide general background but does not contribute directly to analysis of the proposed project. When a document is incorporated by reference in an EIR, the lead agency must make the documents available for inspection at its offices or at some other public building or office in the county. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require that incorporated materials be circulated for public review with the EIR, nor do they require circulation or public availability of subsidiary documents that are incorporated in a document that is then incorporated into an EIR.

According to Practice Under the California Environmental Quality Act (Zischke et al. 2005), State CEQA Guidelines Section 15087(c)(5) should be read with 14 Cal Code Regs §15150(b), which requires that documents incorporated by reference be made available for public inspection. It should not be interpreted to apply to documents that are cited in an EIR under 14 Cal Code Regs §15148, since there is no requirement that such documents be made available for public inspection.

DEIR 2005 for the Home Depot project included two volumes. Volumes II consisted of Appendices A through J, as stated on page vi and numerous places in Chapter 4.0, and contained technical data that supported the analysis provided in DEIR 2005. Appendices were made available for public

review at the City, Department of Planning and Building. This included the technical data in the Air Quality Analysis, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Noise Impact Analysis, and TIA. The City provided the technical data that supported the technical reports in DEIR 2005 Appendices to California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and Air Quality Management District (AQMD), at their request.

In addition, the following documents were incorporated by reference and/or made available for public review at the City Department of Planning and Building:

- Preliminary Hydrology Study
- Alternatives Analysis Supporting Data
- City of Long Beach General Plan
- City of Long Beach Zoning Code

Although there is no statutory requirement that cited documents be made available for public review, the City attempted to provide the locations and/or copies of cited materials at the request of the commenter, but was unable to provide a comprehensive list within the 45-day public review period. It should be noted that the City fulfilled its legal obligation to make all the documents incorporated by reference and technical appendices available for public review.

P-1-8

Please refer to Response to Comment P-1-7.

P-1-9

Please refer to Response to Comment P-1-7.

P-1-10

The Long Beach–East Pacific Coast Highway air quality monitoring station only has data for 2003 and 2004 available; there are no exceedance counts or annual averages. DEIR 2005 used the North Long Beach station data because it also represents the conditions at the project site, and provides PM₁₀ data back to 1984 and PM_{2.5} data back to 1999.

P-1-11

See Responses to Comments R-1-3 and R-1-4 for a discussion of the assumptions and comparisons made for the Diesel Toxics Analysis section of DEIR 2005. The SCAQMD has established a maximum individual cancer risk significance threshold of 10 in one million (10×10^{-6}) and a Hazard Index of 1.0 for noncarcinogens. A screening-level single pathway analysis of diesel exhaust from trucks operating as part of the project was performed, analyzing only the inhalation pathway. This technique was chosen as recommended in the OEHHA Air Toxic Hotspots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines (August 2003), Appendix D, Risk Assessment Procedures to Evaluate Particulate Emissions from Diesel-Fueled Vehicles. For risk assessment procedures, the OEHHA specifies that the surrogate for whole diesel exhaust is diesel particulate. According to ARB (HARP Model

Documentation, Appendix K, Risk Assessment Procedures to Evaluate Particulate Emissions from Diesel-Fueled Engines, ARB, Feb 2005.), when conducting a health risk assessment (HRA), the potential cancer risk from inhalation exposure to diesel PM will outweigh the potential noncancer health impacts. When comparing whole diesel exhaust to speciated diesel exhaust (e.g., PAHs, metals), potential cancer risk from inhalation exposure to whole diesel exhaust will outweigh the multipathway cancer risk from the speciated components. For this reason, there will be few situations where an analysis of multipathway risk is necessary. The present project does not require such analysis.

P-1-12

Please refer to Response to Comment R-1-4 for a detailed discussion of the assumptions and comparisons made for the Diesel Toxics Analysis found in DEIR 2005.

P-1-13

Please refer to Response to Comment R-1-4 for a detailed discussion of the assumptions and comparisons made for the Diesel Toxics Analysis found in DEIR 2005.

P-1-14

Please refer to Response to Comment R-1-4 for a detailed discussion of the assumptions and comparisons made for the Diesel Toxics Analysis found in DEIR 2005.

P-1-15

Please refer to Response to Comment R-1-4 for a detailed discussion of the assumptions and comparisons made for the Diesel Toxics Analysis found in DEIR 2005.

P-1-16

The comment states that DEIR 2005 does not present analysis of construction emissions and toxic air constituents. The first reason that the health impacts from construction activities were not analyzed in more detail is that construction activities are not expected to last long enough to result in significant health risks. The only toxic air contaminant (TAC) emitted from construction activities at this site of significance will be diesel exhaust particulate. This TAC is not considered to have a significant short-term health effect, thus any analysis of the health risks from this TAC are on a 70-year, lifetime exposure basis. Since the total period of construction emissions will be measured in months, the affect over a 70-year period is negligible.

The emissions shown in Table 4.2.I are for grading only. The total grading operation might take a month or two. As discussed in DEIR 2005, other construction activities are expected to emit significantly less emissions than grading. Secondly, while the commenter refers to Table 4.2.J when referring to PM₁₀ emissions from construction exhaust, the correct table is Table 4.2.I. Table 4.2.J includes the fugitive dust generated by dirt pushing, dumping, etc., which, while it does have human health implications, is not included in a diesel exhaust particulate health risk discussion. The total diesel exhaust PM shown in Table 4.2.I is far less than the total PM₁₀ emissions shown in Table

4.2.K. Therefore, diesel exhaust emissions during construction are normally not included or combined with long-term operational emissions in the health risk assessment.

P-1-17

Please refer to Response to Comment P-1-16.

P-1-18

Please refer to Response to Comment R-1-3 and R-1-4 for a detailed discussion of the assumptions and comparisons made for the Diesel Toxics Analysis found in DEIR 2005.

P-1-19

The discussion of construction impacts is generalized because no specific information is available at this time. However, all attempts were made to conservatively calculate the expected emissions in a representative manner. There is no comprehensive, detailed list of construction equipment, but rather a list of typical equipment used for the indicated activities, which focuses on the equipment issuing the most emissions. The text describes the construction equipment as “working as much as 10 hours per day,” and Table 4.2.I lists some equipment that operates for 10 hours per day and others that operate for 8 hours per day. In every case, the emission rates listed in Table 4.2.I correspond to the number of hours of operation shown. Therefore, the construction emissions presented in DEIR 2005 are reasonable estimates based on reasonable and conservative assumptions.

P-1-20

Please refer to Response to Comment P-1-19. The emissions estimates provided in DEIR 2005 accurately report anticipated levels of air pollutants. Therefore, no further response is required.

P-1-21

The building erection phase of the construction process involves equipment that is smaller than the large dozers, scrapers, and excavators that are used for grading. The analysis included into the Draft EIR is “worst-case” and is based on the larger equipment with higher exhaust emissions. Additionally, the fugitive dust emissions are also much higher during grading than building erection. DEIR 2005 listed mitigation measures for construction sufficient to handle the larger emissions during the grading operations; therefore, during the building erection period, these same mitigation measures will be more than adequate. Please see DEIR 2005 for reported emissions and thresholds.

P-1-22

SCAQMD Rule 403 specifies that dirt will not be tracked out off site. It says “Any person in the South Coast Air Basin shall: (1) prevent or remove within one hour the track-out of bulk material onto public paved roadways as a result of their operations; or (2) take at least one of the actions listed in Table 3 and: (i) prevent the track-out of bulk material onto public paved roadways as a result of their operations and remove such material at anytime track-out extends for a cumulative distance of greater than 50 feet on to any paved public road during active operations; and (ii) remove all visible

roadway dust tracked-out upon public paved roadways as a result of active operations at the conclusion of each work day when active operations cease.”

Table 3, Track-Out Control Options, paragraph (d)(5)(B) includes the following control options: (1) Pave or apply chemical stabilization at sufficient concentration and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface starting from the point of intersection with the public paved surface, and extending for a centerline distance of at least 100 feet and a width of at least 20 feet; (2) Pave from the point of intersection with the public paved road surface, and extending for a centerline distance of at least 25 feet and a width of at least 20 feet, and install a track-out control device immediately adjacent to the paved surface such that exiting vehicles do not travel on any unpaved road surface after passing through the track-out control device; and (3) Any other control measures approved by the Executive Officer and the U.S. EPA as equivalent to the methods specified in Table 3 may be used.

These control options are paraphrased in DEIR 2005 mitigation measures. This project will comply with Rule 403.

P-1-23

As stated on page 4.8-21 of DEIR 2005, industrially zoned properties may construct a 12 foot high fence within the required street frontage setback area and variations in fence heights can be approved through site plan review. The maximum fence height information provided in Section 4.8, Land Use, pertains to fences constructed within required street frontage setback for both commercial and industrially zoned properties, subject to several provisions. The City of Long Beach Zoning Code also specifies that fences on industrially zoned property may be 8 feet high when they abut residential side or rear yards, and 12 feet high for other yards. Therefore the sound wall required by Mitigation Measure 4.9.1 is consistent with the information provided in DEIR 2005 and the City of Long Beach Zoning Code.

P-1-24

The results and conclusions from the TIA are correct and substantiated based on the City’s policies and procedures, the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan (CMP), and State CEQA Guidelines.

P-1-25

Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 adequately analyzed all questions outlined in Appendix G, Section XV of the CEQA Guidelines. In addition to the Guidelines in Appendix G, the City consistently utilizes significance criteria for intersections and roadways within its jurisdiction in all TIAs. The TIA analyzed the circulation system based on the criteria set by the City and State CEQA Guidelines. The TIA is thorough and complete and can be relied upon for the purposes of CEQA.

P-1-26

Please refer to Response to Comment P-1-25. The definition of a potential environmental impact to a street system per Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines is 1) a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, 2) exceedance of thresholds for volume to capacity ratios and, 3) a substantial

increase to congestion at intersections. Prior to the preparation of the TIA, the City selected the study area based on trip distribution from the proposed project. Trip distribution for the proposed project was based on logical travel corridors and minimum time paths. Using the trip distribution methodology, the City of Long Beach could assign project traffic volumes to the adjacent street system to determine where significant impacts may occur. The study area included intersections along the major travel routes to the project site (i.e., Loynes Drive, Studebaker Road, 2nd Street). The TIA is thorough and complete and can be relied upon for the purposes of CEQA.

P-1-27

Please refer to Response to Comment P-1-26. The TIA is thorough and complete and can be relied upon for the purposes of CEQA.

P-1-28

The significance criteria utilized by the City for CEQA analysis are provided in the TIA (see Response to Comment P-1-25). As stated in Response to Comment P-1-26, the definition of a potential environmental impact to a street system per Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines is 1) a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, 2) exceedance of thresholds for volume to capacity ratios and, 3) a substantial increase to congestion at intersections. Although neither the State CEQA Guidelines nor the City defines significance criteria specifically for a neighborhood cut-through traffic analysis, the significance criteria used for CEQA analysis is generally appropriate. Based on the result of the timed surveys, the difference in travel times between the direct and cut-through routes range between 15 seconds to 36 seconds during the a.m. peak hour for inbound traffic. The direct outbound route via Loynes Drive and PCH is approximately 1 minute and 41 seconds faster in the a.m. peak hour and 2 minutes and 42 seconds faster in the p.m. peak hour than the cut-through route. Therefore the timed surveys conducted in the University Park Estates showed that the cut-through route did not result in a substantial travel time benefit for motorists. For this reason, this route would not be seen as an attractive travel route for most motorists and there would not be any incentive to use the route. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that there would be a substantial increase in vehicle trips within the neighborhood. Because there will not be a substantial increase in traffic within the neighborhood, there is no significant impact resulting from neighborhood cut-through traffic.

P-1-29

The City has guidelines in determining and analyzing the study area for a proposed project. The TIA included intersections along major arterials where project traffic was anticipated to add a significant amount of peak-hour trips. The TIA did analyze the intersection of Bixby Village/Loynes Drive (access to the adjacent neighborhood) in the existing and cumulative condition. The percent of project traffic destined to the University Park Estates neighborhood and adjacent neighborhoods is approximately 3 percent of the project trip generation (i.e., 7 a.m. and 12 p.m. peak-hour vehicles). Traffic to/from these neighborhoods would be generated by the existing residents themselves, and not residents from other communities. As such, the roadways and intersections within the neighborhoods were not analyzed as part of the intersection impact analysis. Please also see Response P-1-28, which indicates that the amount of traffic created by the project affecting the neighborhood is not substantial, and, therefore, is not a significant impact.

P-1-30

The TIA included two inbound, cut-through routes that provided direct travel (i.e., shortest distance) through the neighborhood. The two cut-through routes provided less turn movements and less stop-controlled intersections that would equate to longer travel times. Therefore, the addition of the cut-through routes via 5th Street and 6th Street would not change the results of the analysis. The cut-through travel times would be greater due to the additional turning movements and stops along the other available options. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic and Responses to Comments P-1-28 and P-1-129.

P-1-31

A complete neighborhood street impact analysis was not provided in the TIA as the traffic at the intersections and roadways within the University Park Estates are due to the number of project trips (i.e., 3 percent) destined to the neighborhood. The proposed project would contribute approximately 7 a.m. peak-hour and 12 p.m. peak-hour trips to the University Park and Bixby Village neighborhoods. This did not warrant a detailed analysis in the local street system. In addition, based on the timed surveys, the cut-through route is not an attractive route for motorists because there would be no time savings to cut-through motorists. Furthermore, a cumulative analysis would not be included for the neighborhood analysis because a substantial amount of traffic is not forecast to travel through the neighborhood. See Responses P-1-28 through P-1-30. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-1-32

The timed surveys conducted in the University Park Estates showed that the cut-through route did not significantly benefit the travel time for motorists. Therefore, the cut-through routes would not be attractive to motorists, whether traveling to the project site or areas south of the project site. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-1-33

See Response to Comment P-1-29.

P-1-34

DEIR 2005 and TIA provided a qualitative analysis to address the issue of potential cut-through traffic. Timed surveys were conducted and analysis showed that the cut-through routes did not provide a significant benefit in travel time. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-1-35

Table D in DEIR 2005 is incorrect. The trip generation stated on page 20 of Appendix J, and all analyses to determine project impacts based on these numbers, was correct. The TIA analyzed the project impacts based on the correct trip generation, reported in Tables in Appendix J, page 20.

P-1-36

The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual was cited in the TIA as providing trip generation estimates for the proposed project (Appendix J of DEIR 2005). Source documents used in preparing an EIR need not be included in the EIR or EIR Appendices. In addition, there is no requirement that such documents be made available for public inspection (14 Cal Code Regs §15148). Please see Response to Comment P-1-7.

P-1-37

See Response to Comment P-1-35.

P-1-38

See Response to Comment P-1-35.

P-1-39

The proposed project and the Reduced Project Alternative include entry canopies that may extend to a height of 39 feet. The proposed project was modified and described in the Recirculated Draft EIR. Entry canopies would be a maximum of 35 feet. It should be noted that entry canopies are not considered to be part of the building, which is limited to a height of 32 feet. Furthermore, according to Table 3-33 in Chapter 21.33 of the City of Long Beach Zoning Code there is no maximum height for non-building structures in the IG zone. The proposed site plan, including entry canopies, will undergo site plan review. The City may impose limitations on the height of the entry canopies at that time or as a condition of development. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005; therefore, no further response is necessary.

P-1-40

As stated on page 6-9 of DEIR 2005, the reduced project alternative would incorporate 30 percent open space requirement of PD-1 (SEADIP) so that a standards variance would not be required. This alternative would not include the enhanced landscaping described in Chapter 3.0, although the Reduced Project Alternative would still incorporate substantial landscaping elements as required by municipal code. For clarification, a sentence in section 6.4.3 (page 6-9) will be rewritten to say, "In addition, it is anticipated that this alternative would include substantial landscaping in open space areas, but would not include the enhanced, themed landscaping that is part of the proposed project." As stated on the page 6-9, it is expected that the home improvement store would visually dominate the view of motorist traveling on Loynes Drive toward Studebaker Road, but that the building would visually blend into its surroundings when viewed from a significant distance and elevation (scenic vista). The clarification has no substantive effect of the analysis contained in DEIR 2005. Aesthetic impacts that would result from the Reduced Project Alternative are not worsened because enhanced/themed landscaping is not included; the alternative will still incorporate substantial amounts of open space and landscaping, per code requirements. The differences between code-required landscaping and the "enhanced, themed landscaping" is not consequential to the findings of the DEIR aesthetics analysis, especially for distant views. There is no new significant impact associated with the clarification, no new mitigation is required.

P-1-41

Please refer to Response to Comment P-1-40.

P-1-42

As stated on page 4.1-7, scenic vistas are defined as viewpoints greater than one mile from a receptor that consist of horizon line views. Because of the urban character of the surrounding area, the proposed project – and the Reduced Project Alternative – would blend into its surrounding when viewed from a significant distance and elevation (i.e., a scenic vista). Therefore, the effect of the proposed project – or the Reduced Project Alternative – on any scenic vista that may exist from a distant off-site area (per the definition of a scenic vista) is not considered adverse and no mitigation is necessary. Please also see Response P-1-40 for additional explanation.

P-1-43

Please refer to Response to Comment P-1-42.

P-1-44

DEIR 2005 included all significance criteria from Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines and criteria adopted by the City of Long Beach. Please see Response to Comment P-1-40 through P-1-42.

P-1-45

Please refer to Response to Comments P-1-35 through P-1-38. The trip generation for the reduced Project Alternative is presented in Table 6.E. The methodology used to derive trip generation rates for the proposed project is explained on page 4.11-9. As stated on page 6-20, the trips generated by the Reduced Project Alternative were distributed to the study area intersections using the same trip distribution as the proposed project. The trip distribution is discussed in Section 4.11, Transportation and Circulation. As Table 6.F indicates traffic signal phasing for Studebaker and Loynes was included in the traffic analysis for the Reduced Project Alternative. Table 6.H provides a comparison of the Proposed Project levels of service with the Reduced Project levels of service.

P-1-46

As stated on page 6-23, the trip generation of the Reduced Project Alternative is less than the proposed project trip generation for both weekday and weekend peak hours. The Reduced Project Alternative includes intersection improvements and signal phasing at the intersection of Studebaker and Loynes. As shown in Table 6.G, the following two intersections would be significantly impacted during the weekend peak hour with implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative: 1) Studebaker Road/2nd Street, and 2) PCH/2nd Street. The impact at the Studebaker Road/2nd Street intersection could be reduced to a less than significant level by providing an additional through lane on westbound 2nd Street. Due to right-of-way constraints at the intersection of PCH/2nd Street, there are no feasible improvements that would mitigate the project's, or the alternative's impacts at this intersection.

Therefore, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in a significant unavoidable impact at this location during the weekend period.

As explained on page 6-23 in DEIR 2005, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in two fewer significant impacts during the weekday peak hour and one fewer impact in the weekend peak hour than the proposed project. One of the significant impacts that would result during the weekend peak hour could be mitigated to a less than significant level, one would remain significant and unavoidable. DEIR 2005 does not cite economic infeasibility as a reason for not mitigating a project or alternative impact. The impact to the intersection of PCH and 2nd Street cannot be mitigated due to right-of-way constraints.

P-1-47

Please refer to Response to Comment P-1-45 through P-1-47. The City of Long Beach respectfully disagrees with opinions expressed regarding the CEQA analysis. Chapter 6.0, Alternatives complies with State CEQA Guidelines for analysis of project alternatives and recirculation of the EIR is not required under State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. These comments will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-1-48

The commenter took the quote from the Executive Summary of the new Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective out of context. The text continues on to state, "While we provide some suggestions, how to best achieve that goal is a local issue." This is one major reason for this or any EIR; to assist the local agencies and the public to best achieve that goal. The second quote left out a significant word: "new." The text actually reads: "Avoid siting *new* sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a distribution center (that accommodates more than 100 trucks per day, more than 40 trucks with operating transport refrigeration units (TRUs) per day, or where TRU unit operations exceed 300 hours per week)." This section is a discussion of how best to locate new residential or other sensitive uses, not how to best locate distribution centers. This project does not include any new residential or other sensitive land uses. Further in the handbook it states, "This Handbook is an informational document that we hope will strengthen the relationship between air quality and land use agencies. It highlights the need for land use agencies to address the potential for new projects to result in localized health risk or contribute to cumulative impacts where air pollution sources are concentrated." This handbook is not intended to be a rule book that projects need to comply with, but rather a guidance document for land use agencies. It does not supersede the federal, State and local regulations that DEIR 2005 was written to comply with.

P-1-49

Please see Response to Comment P-1-48.

P-1-50

Table D in the Traffic Impact Analysis is incorrect; however, the trip generation stated on page 20 of Appendix J is correct. All analyses to determine project impacts were based on the numbers listed on page 20 and are therefore correct.

P-1-51

Refer to Response to Comment P-1-48. Please note that Alternative 4: Existing Zoning/Light Industrial does not include a distribution center.

P-1-52

See Response to Comment P-1-50.

P-1-53

The Reduced Project Alternative would include mitigation similar to that of the proposed project to reduce impacts to less than significant levels; therefore the impacts for this alternative identified in Chapter 6.0 are correct. For cost feasibility reasons, this alternative does not include extra features proposed as part of the project, such as enhanced landscaping, outdoor courtyards/plaza areas, a dry streambed, meandering sidewalks, or project design feature nos. 3 through 9 on page 4.11-7.

Reasonable alternatives were considered in DEIR 2005, consistent with Section 15126.6 (c) of the CEQA guidelines. As discussed in DEIR 2005, the project area is built out and there are existing impacted intersections in the area; therefore, any development on this site would likely result in significant traffic impacts. In addition, for any development on the 17.8-acre site, significant construction air quality impacts are likely. Finally, as discussed in Section 4.10, at the time of DEIR 2005 circulation for public review, any development in the City of Long Beach would be required to acknowledge a significant cumulative impact related to solid waste (landfill capacity). Therefore, the fact that the alternatives considered would reduce impacts when compared to the proposed project fulfills the “reasonability” requirement under CEQA.

P-1-54

Refer to Response to Comment P-1-53. During the EIR development process, Home Depot indicated that the size of its stores and garden centers are standard based on their product line requirements to make the store economically viable in the store’s market. The Garden Center is an intrinsic part of a Home Depot Center. Therefore, reducing the size of, or removing the garden center, which is considered a key project component, would not represent a reasonable alternative.

P-1-55

Refer to Response to Comment P-1-53 and P-1-54. DEIR 2005 properly analyzes a reasonable range of alternatives consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6.

P-1-56

See Response to Comment L-2-5.

P-1-57

See Response to Comment L-2-5.

P-1-58

See Response to Comment L-2-5.

P-1-59

The TIA and DEIR addressed and analyzed all environmental concerns raised during the scoping process. Please see Responses to Comments L-2-5, P-1-29, and P-1-34.

P-1-60

Opinions expressed regarding the quality of the CEQA analysis will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. DEIR 2005 included all significance criteria from Appendix G of CEQA and criteria adopted by the City. In addition, it addressed all traffic conditions in the existing and cumulative horizons consistent with the guidelines adopted by the City. DEIR 2005 provided sufficient information regarding project alternatives, and provided a comparison to the proposed Home Depot project. The comment is a listing or summary of points made previously in comments P-1-7 through P-1-55. Please refer to Response to Comments P-1-7 through P-1-55.

P-1-61

Please refer to Response to Comment P-1-7.

P-1-62

This comment concludes the comment letter and does not contain any substantive statements or questions about the Draft EIR. Per her request, the commentator will be added to the mailing list for future distributions related to the proposed project. Public comment letters and all information contained therein are part of the public record for the proposed project. No further response is necessary.

JEAN STABLEFORD

P-2-1

The commentator opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

FREDERICK E. AKERS

P-3-1

The comment is the e-mail transmittal for the comment letter and does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005; therefore, no further response is necessary.

P-3-2

The comment consists of an introduction to the comment letter. The commentator opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-3-3

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-3-4

As stated in DEIR 2005, a neighborhood cut-through traffic analysis was conducted in March 2005. Based on the result of the timed surveys, the difference in travel times between the direct and cut-through routes range between 15 seconds to 36 seconds during the a.m. peak hour for inbound traffic. The direct outbound route via Loynes Drive and PCH is approximately 1 minute and 41 seconds faster in the a.m. peak hour and 2 minutes and 42 seconds faster in the p.m. peak hour than the cut-through route. Therefore the timed surveys conducted in the University Park Estates showed that the cut-through route did not result in a substantially travel time benefit for motorists. For this reason, this route would not be seen as an attractive travel route for most motorists. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-3-5

The comment states the proposed project does not adequately protect Alamitos Bay from parking lot runoff and sewage disposal. Sewage disposal is discussed in DEIR 2005 in the public services and utilities section. The analysis concluded that the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to the provision of sewer services. In addition, the public services and utilities analysis was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Storm water runoff from the site, including parking lot runoff, would be treated via vegetated bioswales and manufactured CDS units (centrifugal units that trap gross solids) consistent with City water quality design standards. Water quality modeling evaluated the effectiveness of these treatment measures as well as other control measures and found pollutant levels would be reduce to levels below the existing storm water pollutant levels on the site. Please refer to Response to Comment P-59-5, DEIR 2005, and the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-3-6

This comment states an opinion that the proposed sewage system is not adequately described in DEIR 2005. The Project Description and Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005 were revised and recirculated for

public review on June 2, 2006. Refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information regarding the proposed improvements to the public sewer system.

The Recirculated Draft EIR includes information regarding proposed improvements to the public sewer system, information regarding sewer generation rates, and capacity of sewer lines and sewer treatment plants. The information and analysis provided in the Recirculated Draft EIR are consistent with CEQA requirements to provide a thorough and complete analysis of the environmental consequences of the proposed project.

P-3-7

The comment expresses disbelief that the proposed project will be a Home Depot Design Center. The project does not proposed 24 hour operations. Proposed hours of operation are included Section 3.3. Home Depot Design Centers are design and service stores that take projects from concept to completion. Home Depot Design Centers offer homeowners professional design and installation services and carry well regarded home improvement and design products. The traditional customer at a design center is a homeowner doing home remodeling or repair or a “buy-it-yourself” customer who will hire a contractor to install the materials purchased. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein; and, no further response is necessary.

P-3-8

The comment expresses opposition to a zone change for the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-3-9

The comment suggests that DEIR 2005 should have analyzed the fiscal impact of the project in terms of municipal services and sales tax revenue. As a general rule, an EIR is required to evaluate only the environmental impacts of a project, and economic and social effects of a project are not treated as significant effects on the environment (14CCR§15131(a)). Economic and social effects that are not related to physical impacts need not be evaluated in an EIR. DEIR 2005 evaluated physical impacts related to the provision of police and fire services in Section 4.10. In addition, the public service and utilities analysis was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

FREDERICK AND REYNA AKERS

P-4-1

The comment consists of an introduction to the comment letter. The commenters oppose the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA process will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-4-2

The comment erroneously states that five intersections were evaluated in the traffic analysis for the proposed project. The City of Long Beach Traffic and Transportation Bureau staff provided a Development Traffic Impact–Preliminary Assessment form that outlined the study area and methodology for the traffic impact analysis. DEIR 2005 included analysis of 11 intersections.

Construction impacts are temporary during the period of construction, and the number of construction workers would vary depending on the specific construction activities over time. To reduce the impact of construction traffic and roadwork, Mitigation Measure 4.11.1 requires the development of a Construction Management Plan prior to issuance of a grading permit. The Construction Management Plan will minimize traffic impacts to the local circulation system in the area. The plan shall be designed by a registered Traffic Engineer and will address traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation and public transit routes. The plan will identify the routes that construction vehicles will use to access the site, the hours of construction traffic, traffic controls and detours, off-site vehicle staging areas, and parking areas for the project. The plan will also require project contractors to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including but not limited to gravel and dirt.

P-4-3

This comment states an opinion that DEIR 2005 did not adequately address the sewage needs of the proposed project. The Project Description and Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005 were revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Refer to the revised Project Description and Section 4.3 of the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information regarding the proposed improvements to the public sewer system.

The Recirculated Draft EIR includes information regarding proposed improvements to the public sewer system, information regarding sewer generation rates, and capacity of sewer lines and sewer treatment plants. The information and analysis provided in the Recirculated Draft EIR are consistent with CEQA requirements to provide a thorough and complete analysis of the environmental consequences of the proposed project.

Although analysis in DEIR 2005 was based on a Draft Hydraulic Study, the Final Hydraulic Study was submitted to LBWD August 2005. The findings of the Final Hydraulic Study are consistent with the findings of the Draft Hydraulic Study and no significant impacts to the LBWD sewer system will result from project implementation. It should be noted that information and findings in the Final Hydraulic Study did not change the conclusions in DEIR 2005; there is no significant impact associated with the revised analysis and no new mitigation is required.

P-4-4

This comment requests information about haul trucks during construction. As stated in Section 4.2, the project would require approximately 60 haul truck trips traveling 30 miles each way and one water truck traveling 15 miles per day during demolition. Approximately 40 haul truck trips traveling 30 miles each way and 1 water truck traveling 15 miles each day would be required during construction.

P-4-5

The comment summarizes the points raised in the comment letter. The commenters oppose the proposed project and raise a series of policy questions and/or issues. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. No further response is required.

P-4-6

This comment concludes the comment letter. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

KERRIE ALEY

P-5-1

This commenter states that she believe the market to be saturated with big box stores. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-5-2

This comment states that the City lacks a cohesive traffic plan for this area of the City. The City of Long Beach has an adopted Circulation Element in its General Plan. The General Plan expresses the community's development goals and embodies public policy relative to the distribution of future land uses, both public and private. By statute, the circulation element addresses major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals, and other local public utilities and facilities throughout the City.

MAUREEN SWAFFIELD

P-6-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

ROGA ANDERSON

P-7-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-7-2

Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-7-3

The commenter states that in his opinion, the best alternative for the project site is a public storage facility. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-7-4

The commenter states that he supports the Seaport Marina project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

ROGER AND BARBARA ANDRIES

P-8-1

This comment is introductory. Opinions expressed regarding the quality of the CEQA analysis will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-8-2

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-8-3

This comment states that the proposed Seaport Marina project was omitted from the Traffic Study included in DEIR 2005. The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 (b)(1)(A) states that a Lead Agency must include a “list of past, present, and probably future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency.” At the time preparation of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and DEIR 2005 began, the City identified two approved/pending projects (cumulative) within the project area: (1) 120 Studebaker Road, and (2) the Boeing Specific Plan. At this time, the proposed Seaport Marina project was not considered to be a probable or reasonably foreseeable project given that: (1) no project application had been submitted to the City for that project; (2) the project requires a General Plan amendment; and (3) neither residential nor retail development is permitted on the project site.

By the time City made the decision to recirculate portions of DEIR 2005, an application had been submitted for the Seaport Marina project and the NOP for the proposed Seaport Marina project was issued on May 16, 2005. Therefore, despite the land use permits required for implementation, the City determined that it was reasonable to include cumulative analysis of potential traffic, air quality, and noise impacts of the proposed Seaport Marina and Home Depot projects. Analysis of cumulative impacts was limited to these three topics because Home Depot’s project and cumulative impacts for all other topics (with the exception of cumulative solid waste disposal capacity in Los Angeles County) can be mitigated to a less than significant level.

The cumulative impact analysis conducted for the Draft EIR and Recirculated Draft EIR was conducted consistent with Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines and evaluated all projects that the City as Lead Agency deemed appropriate for consideration as cumulative projects. Guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness, the City made determinations as to which projects were to be evaluated in the Draft EIR and Draft Recirculated Draft EIR. Please refer to Common Response 2 for a further discussion of the evaluation of Seaport Marina.

P-8-4

Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-8-5

Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-8-6

This comment states that the EIR finds that there would be a significant increase in weekend-traffic. DEIR 2005 addresses weekend traffic and related impacts. The EIR states that there would be a significant unavoidable impact at two intersections during the weekend peak hour: PCH/2nd Street and PCH/7th Street. Please refer to section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 for additional information.

P-8-7

Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-7 and O-3-8.

P-8-8

Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-9.

P-8-9

Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-10.

P-8-10

This comment disagrees with the analysis of biological impacts presented in DEIR 2005. Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-11.

P-8-11

This comment states the project will require a local coastal development permit. Please refer to Responses to Comments O-1-23 and O-3-12.

P-8-12

Please refer to Responses to Comments L-1-4, L-1-5, and O-3-13.

P-8-13

The quotes provided in the comment refer to calls for fire, medical, and police services. The proposed project will not significantly impact emergency response times. In a letter dated August 2, 2004, the City Fire Department indicated that the additional call volume generated by the proposed project will increase workload in an area of the City where the Fire Department already has response times that are within Department goals. With project implementation, the response profile for the project area will remain unchanged in terms of service delivery.

In addition, the Police Department does not expect existing response times to change with project implementation (Susanne Steiner, Detective, April 12, 2004). The existing response time in the City is, however, 5.2 minutes, which is 0.2 minutes longer than the response time goal of 5 minutes. Therefore, the proposed project will contribute to an existing deficiency. Mitigation Measure 4.10.3

requires implementation of a Security Plan to reduce project impacts to police services. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10.3, project impacts related to the provision of police services will be reduced to a less than significant level. Please note that the public service and utilities analysis in DEIR 2005 was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-8-14

The comment suggests that a technical and professional office complex would be a more appropriate use of the project site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-8-15

The comment suggests that a public storage facility would be a more appropriate use of the project site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

MARIANNE AND SAM APPEL

P-9-1

This comment is introductory. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-9-2

The commenter opposes the proposed project and implies that the project will destroy wetlands in the Los Cerritos Channel. The comment is not substantiated with any fact or additional information. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. No potential jurisdictional wetlands were identified at the project site or within the portion of the Los Cerritos Channel near the proposed sewer line construction. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

DONNA AUSTIN

P-10-1

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-10-2

The comment erroneously states that the proposed project will destroy wetlands. As stated in Section 4.3 of DEIR 2005, no potential jurisdictional wetlands were identified at the project site or within the portion of the Los Cerritos Channel near the proposed sewer line construction. Please also see Response to Comment P-9-2.

P-10-3

This comment refers to a “toxic waste dumpsite” along Studebaker Road near Loynes Drive and that construction could cause the dumpsite to leak. This comment appears to refer to the former Class III landfill on the westside of Studebaker Road which is not part of the project site. Refer to Response to Comment O-7-9. Please refer to Appendix F of DEIR 2005 and the Recirculated EIR for further information.

P-10-4

The commenter opposes the proposed project. The comment summarized points made previously regarding traffic and wetlands impact, responded to in Responses to Comments P-10-1 and P-10-2. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

JOHN AND LORRAINE BENNETT

P-11-1

This comment expresses concern regarding potential traffic and circulation impacts. Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 addresses traffic and circulation impacts of the proposed project and the Recirculated Draft EIR included a cumulative analysis of the proposed Seaport Marina project. The City of Long Beach will require implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.11.1 through 4.11.9. Even with implementation of these mitigation measures, the proposed project will result in significant impacts to the following intersections:

Weekday Peak Hour

- Studebaker Road/SR-22 westbound ramps
- Studebaker Road/SR-22 eastbound ramps (with the Seaport Marina project included)

Weekend Midday Peak Hour

- PCH/7th Street
- PCH/2nd Street

P-11-2

This comment questions the need for the proposed Home Depot. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-11-3

This comment expresses concern about truck traffic on the project site. This proposed project is a Home Depot Design Center, not a Home Depot Expo. Truck traffic is addressed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005.

P-11-4

This comment suggests clean industry or a business park for the proposed project site. Opinions expressed regarding alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-11-5

This comment states that the project will negatively affect quality of life in the City of Long Beach. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

BARBARA BLACKWELL

P-12-1

Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-1.

P-12-2

Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-2.

P-12-3

Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-3.

P-12-4

Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-4.

P-12-5

Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-5.

P-12-6

Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-6.

PHYLLIS BLATZ

P-13-1

The commenter is concerned about the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-13-2

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-13-3

The comment challenges the finding of the Biological Resources Report for the proposed project. Biological resources impacts were evaluated as a result of a reconnaissance survey, focused surveys for the burrowing owl, and a jurisdictional delineation of waters of the U.S. in accordance with methodologies established by the US Army Corps of Engineers, the US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the California Department of Fish and Game. Refer to Section 4.3 of DEIR 2005 for additional information. The analysis in DEIR 2005 is complete and thorough, and fully characterizes effects on wildlife and wetlands. Without data or new information presented in the comment, no further response is necessary.

P-13-4

This comment expresses an opinion about the need for the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

ROBERT BLOWERS (MAY 9, 2005)

P-14-1

The commentor opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-14-2

The commentor opposes the project because of its potential air quality and traffic congestion impacts. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-14-3

This comment suggests that the area be preserved as a residential area. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-14-4

This comment suggests that the area be used as open space or parkland. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

ROBERT BLOWERS (JUNE 10, 2005)

P-15-1

This comment is introductory. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-15-2

This comment states that noise and traffic were inadequately addressed in the EIR for the proposed project but does not provide specific reasons as to why the commenter believes the analysis to be inadequate. Potential noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.9 of DEIR 2005. Potential traffic impacts were addressed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Please refer to Section 4.9 and Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005, as well as the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-15-3

This comment states that impacts to Studebaker Road are not adequately addressed in the EIR. Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 evaluates potential project impacts. As stated in DEIR 2005 and the Recirculated Draft EIR, the proposed project would result in a significant unavoidable weekday impact at the westbound onramps to State Route 22 from Studebaker Road. A significant unavoidable weekday impact would occur at the eastbound onramps to State Route 22 from Studebaker Road when Seaport Marina is included in the cumulative analysis. Refer to Response to Comment P-11-1. The other potential project impact to Studebaker Road (at 2nd Street) can be mitigated to a less than significant level.

P-15-4

This comment states that traffic problems in University Park Estates were not addressed in the EIR. It is unclear from the comment what traffic problems are being referenced. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-15-5

This comment states that potential noise and light impacts were not addressed. Potential noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.9 of DEIR 2005. As stated in DEIR 2005, there are no significant unavoidable impacts associated with the proposed project related to noise. Potential light impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Aesthetics. As stated in DEIR 2005, photometric analysis of project lighting shows that spill light is reduced to a maximum of 0.3 fc at 50 feet from the project boundary and a maximum of 0.1 fc at 100 feet from the project boundary. Mitigation Measures 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 are precautionary measures intended to further prevent any potentially adverse impacts from spill light or glare. With incorporation of these measures, any potentially significant impacts from spill light and glare generated by the proposed project are reduced to below a level of significance.

P-15-6

This comment provides information on the 1.1-acre parcels at the intersection of 7th Street and Silvera Avenue. The addition of these parcels to the proposed project is evaluated in Chapter 3.0 of the Recirculated EIR.

P-15-7

The commenter opposes the inclusion of 5 acres of City-owned in the proposed project. No City owned land is included in the proposed project. Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of the Recirculated EIR for a project location map.

P-15-8

This comment states the project site should be used as parkland. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-15-9

This comment expresses concern regarding potential harm children at Kettering Elementary that will result from “transients of unsavory character.” The proposed project site is approximately one-half mile from Kettering Elementary, with the exception of the 1.1-acre parcels at intersection of 7th Street and Silvera Avenue which is proposed to become an extension of Channel View Park. The traditional customer at Design Center like the one proposed are homeowners doing home remodeling or repair or “buy-it-yourself” customers who will hire a contractor to install the materials purchased. There is no evidence provided in the comment to indicate how Home Depot attracts “transients of unsavory character.” The commenter does not explain how the proposed project would place undesirable people at the school site or how the project would offer access to children. Potential increases in calls for police services were evaluated in Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005. Mitigation Measure 4.10.3 requires implementation of a Security Plan to reduce project impacts to police services. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10.3, project impacts related to the provision of police services will be reduced to a less than significant level. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-15-10

This comment anecdotally states that trucks and pickups will visit the proposed project. Potential physical impacts resulting from project traffic was evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. The potential for day-laborers to visit the site was addressed in Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005. Please also refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR and Response to Comment P-15-9 for additional information.

P-15-11

This comment states that traffic from the proposed project will negatively affect quality of life and property values. Potential physical impacts resulting from project traffic was evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for

consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

JOE BLUMENTHAL

P-16-1

The commentor opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-16-2

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-16-3

The comment suggests that Loynes Drive be converted to a local street or closed to through traffic. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-16-4

The commentor opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA analysis in DEIR 2005 will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-16-5

The comment erroneously states that DEIR 2005 did not address Loynes Drive or potential impacts to the University Park neighborhood. Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 included intersections along Loynes Drive adjacent to the project site. The report provided the results of the impact analysis and identified project impacts at these locations. Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-2 and Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-16-6

Please refer to Responses to Comments L-2-2, O-3-3, and Common Response: 2: Seaport Marina.

P-16-7

The comment erroneously states that analysis of cut-through traffic was begun the second week of June. The cut-through neighborhood analysis was conducted during March 2005, not the second week of June. The University and Kettering Elementary School were in session during this time. Based on the timed surveys, the weekend surveys showed that the direct routes are significantly faster than the cut-through routes. Therefore, there is no incentive to use cut-through routes. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-16-8

Please refer to Responses to Comments O-3-7 and O-3-8.

P-16-9

Please refer to Responses to Comments O-3-9 and O-3-10.

P-16-10

Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-11.

P-16-11

Please refer to Responses to Comments L-1-4 and L-1-5.

P-16-12

Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-14.

P-16-13

Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-15.

P-16-14

This comment suggests that a technical and professional office complex would be a more appropriate use for the proposed project site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-16-15

This comment suggests that a public storage facility would be a more appropriate use for the proposed project site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

JOYCE BOLICEK

P-17-1

The comment consists of an introduction to the comment letter. The commentor opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-17-2

Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-2.

P-17-3

Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-3.

P-17-4

Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-4.

P-17-5

Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-5.

P-17-6

This comment concludes the comment letter. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

PETER BROCON

P-18A-1

The commentor opposes the proposed project because of the potential traffic impacts. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

PAUL BUIKA

P-18B-1

The comment consists of an introduction to the comment letter. The commentor opposes the proposed project and states that noise from traffic along Loynes is increasing. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-18B-2

This comment states that the noise analysis in DEIR 2005 does not sufficiently analyze possible increases in noise along Loynes Drive. The primary purpose of the noise monitoring conducted for the proposed project was to establish the existing noise levels within the project area. An additional measurement was conducted off-site, within the Channel View Park, to establish the existing ambient background noise levels. The purpose of this noise monitoring was not to measure the existing traffic noise levels within the residential development.

As shown in Table 8 of the Recirculated Draft EIR, the largest project related increase in traffic noise along Loynes Drive would be 1.8 dBA under the Cumulative Weekend conditions. This increase in noise is less than the 3 dBA threshold of change that is perceptible to the average human ear in an outdoor environment. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant traffic noise impact along Loynes Drive.

P-18B-3

This comment states that the noise analysis in DEIR 2005 does not sufficiently analyze possible noise impacts to home along Loynes Drive and suggests that mitigation requiring a sound wall along Loynes is necessary to mitigate noise impacts. Please refer to Response to Comment P-18B-2 regarding the ambient noise monitoring and the long-term traffic noise impacts along Loynes Drive. As the proposed project would not result in a significant traffic noise impact along Loynes Drive no mitigation measures are required.

P-18B-4

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

KRISTINA CAHILL

P-19-1

This comment is introductory. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-19-2

Please refer to Responses to Comments L-1-4 and L-1-5.

P-19-3

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-19-4

This comment states that additional traffic will pose a danger to children at Kettering Elementary. Kettering Elementary is located approximately one-half mile from the proposed project site. Passing motorists will be required to abide by all applicable traffic laws in the vicinity of the school. Potential impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed project related to traffic and circulation were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-19-5

This comment states that too many wetlands areas have been developed. As stated on page 4.3-9 of DEIR 2005, no potential jurisdictional wetlands were identified at the project site or within the portion of the Los Cerritos Channel near the proposed sewer line construction. Therefore, potential impacts to jurisdictional wetlands as a result of the proposed project are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

P-19-6

This commenter opposes the proposed project. . Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

RUTH CAHILL (MAY 11, 2005)

P-20-1

This comment is introductory. The commenter is concerned about the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-20-2

This comment states that traffic and air quality impacts will pose a danger to children at Kettering Elementary. Kettering Elementary is located approximately one-half mile from the proposed project site. Passing motorist will be required to abide by all applicable traffic laws in the vicinity of the school. Potential impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed project related to traffic and circulation were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Potential air quality impacts were addressed in section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-20-3

Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-20-4

This comment states that traffic issues will make East Long Beach a less desirable place to live. Potential traffic impacts of the proposed project were addressed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005.

P-20-5

This comment states that the proposed project should be situated in a commercial/business district. The proposed project site is located within Subarea 19 of PD-1, Southeast Area Development and Improvement Plan (SEADIP) zoning district. Land uses permitted in Subarea 19 are based on the General Industrial (IG) zoning district standards. The proposed project would require a Conditional Use Permit and standards variances but would otherwise be consistent with the current zoning designation. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

RUTH CAHILL (JUNE 9, 2005)

P-21-1

This commenter states that the 1.1-acre parcel at the intersection of 7th Street and Silvera Avenue has no relation to the proposed Home Depot project. Please refer to Chapter 3.0 of the Recirculated Draft EIR for analysis of project impacts related to inclusion of this parcel in the project site. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-21-2

Please refer to Responses to Comments P-19-4, P-20-2, and Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-21-3

This comment states that University Park Estates has a right to be protected. It is unclear from what the commenter wants protection. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

ANN CANTRELL

P-22-1

This commenter states that she was unable to find DEIR 2005 on the City website. In addition to the website, DEIR 2005 was available for public review at the Long Beach Main Library, Bay Shore Neighborhood Library, El Dorado Neighborhood Library, and Brewitt Neighborhood Library.

P-22-2

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-22-3

The comment states that the church on Studebaker near Anaheim Road should have been included in the cumulative traffic analysis. Refer to Response to Comment P-129-13.

P-22-4

Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-22-5

This comment generally questions mitigation for potential air quality impacts. Potential air quality impacts were analyzed in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005.

As stated in the Recirculated Draft EIR, the proposed project would have significant unavoidable short-term construction air quality impacts (NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions) after the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. The proposed project would also have significant unavoidable long-term operational air quality impacts (CO, ROC, NO_x) due to the lack of feasible mitigation measures to reduce vehicular trip-related emissions. Similarly, the project would contribute to adverse cumulative air quality impacts because the Basin is presently in nonattainment for CO, PM₁₀, and O₃, and the project, in conjunction with other planned projects, would contribute to the existing nonattainment status.

P-22-6

This comment states that more road kill will result from implementation of the proposed project. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-22-7

Please refer to Responses to Comments L-1-4 and L-1-5.

P-22-8

Alternate Site Locations are discussed in Section 6.1.3 of DEIR 2005. As stated in DEIR 2005, the City is nearly built out, with little vacant land available for development. The General Plan and aerial

photographs were used in order to identify potential alternative sites for the proposed project within the City limits. The City Disposition of Vacant Land map (Summer 2001) was also reviewed. This map identifies 11 sites with development potential. The Los Cerritos Wetlands site is the only location in the market area identified by Home Depot. DEIR 2005 also states that a commercial center with a home improvement store is not a water-dependent use and would not be consistent with the Coastal Act. Development of the Los Cerritos Wetlands would result in significant effects to biological resources. Given the limitations imposed by the Coastal Act and the constraints associated with development of coastal wetlands, the use of the Los Cerritos Wetlands as an alternative site for the proposed project is considered infeasible.

ARDOTH CARR

P-23-1

This comment states that DEIR 2005 is flawed because of unnamed exclusions and requests that alternative uses of the site be considered. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

ROB CLARK

P-24-1

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive

P-24-2

The comment states that the proposed Seaport Marina project will negatively impact traffic. Please note that the Recirculated Draft EIR contains cumulative traffic, air quality, and noise analysis of the Home Depot and Seaport Marina projects. This comment does not contain a question about the proposed Home Depot project or any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-24-3

This commenter objects to the consequences of the significant air quality impacts reported in DEIR 2005. Potential air quality impacts were analyzed in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-24-4

The commenter opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

DONNA COATS

P-25-1

The comment states that the proposed Home Depot project will result in cumulative air quality, traffic, and biological resource impacts when considered with the proposed Seaport Marina project and the proposed “pumpkin patch” project. Potential air quality impacts were evaluated in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. Potential traffic impacts were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Potential biological resources impacts were evaluated in Section 4.3 of DEIR 2005. Please note that the Recirculated Draft EIR contains cumulative traffic, air quality, and noise analysis of the Home Depot and Seaport Marina projects. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-25-2

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-25-3

This comment describes changes to Long Beach. The commenter opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

STEPHEN CONLEY (FOR HANK SNAPPER)

P-26-1

The commenter supports project approval. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-26-2

This comment requests that other input received from the Los Cerritos Wetlands Study Group not be included in the Home Depot EIR response to comments because of violations in notification and public hearing requirements. Both sets of comments are included in the Response to Comments pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

JOHN CONTRERAS

P-27-1

This comment relates general concerns about traffic and sewage issues and prefers alternative uses for the sites including an office or professional building. Potential impacts related to traffic were analyzed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Potential impacts related to sewer services were analyzed in Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005. In addition, the public services and utilities analysis was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-27-2

This comment states that there is no excess capacity during AM and PM peak hours under exiting conditions. Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 summarizes the existing operating conditions at 11 intersections within the project vicinity, estimates the trip generation potential of the proposed project, and forecasts future intersection operating conditions at completion and occupancy of the project. An evaluation of the project's access, on-site circulation, and parking needs as well as a qualitative neighborhood street analysis is also provided.

P-27-3

This comment suggests that a proposed project in Seal Beach (Rockwell) will also affect traffic in Long Beach. Two cumulative projects were identified in the cumulative condition based on discussions with the City of Long Beach and City of Seal Beach Planning Departments: (1) 120 Studebaker Road, and (2) the Boeing Specific Plan. Project trip generation for both approved/pending projects was provided by the City of Long Beach and City of Seal Beach Planning Departments. The proposed Seaport Marina project was also added to the cumulative analysis in the Recirculated Draft EIR. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR and Common Response 2: Seaport Marina, for additional information

P-27-4

The commenter opposes any "heavy traffic uses" for the project site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

CAROL COSTELLO

P-28-1

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-28-2

The comment questions the need for the proposed home improvement store and suggests that an office complex be constructed on the project site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-28-3

The commenter states that the proposed project will have a negative affect on the area. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

M. COTTON

P-29-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project and suggests a low level office/manufacturing use on the site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-29-2

This comment states that the Boeing development will impact traffic on Westminster and Second Street. Potential project impacts associated with development of the Boeing property were analyzed in the EIR for that project. In addition, the cumulative impact analysis in DEIR 2005 included the Boeing development as a cumulative project.

P-29-3

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive

P-29-4

Refer to Common Response 2: Seaport Marina.

P-29-5

Please refer to responses to comments O-3-7 and O-3-8.

P-29-6

The comment states that contactors patronizing the proposed Home Depot will increase traffic during AM and PM peak hours. Please refer to response to common O-3-9. In addition, project impacts related to project trip generation during AM and PM peak hours was analyzed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005.

P-29-7

This comment states that runoff from the project site will impact wetlands and cause degradation. The proposed project would not result in adverse impacts to the Los Cerritos Wetlands. Potential impact related to water quality were addressed in Section 4.7 of DEIR 2005. With implementation of the mitigation measures described in that Section, all project impacts will be reduced to less than significant levels. Storm water runoff from the site would be treated via vegetated swales and manufactured CDS units (centrifugal units that trap gross solids) consistent with City water quality design standards (SUSMP). Water quality modeling evaluated the effectiveness of these treatment measures as well as other control measures and found pollutant levels would be reduce to levels below the existing condition. Please refer to DEIR 2005 for additional information.

The comment also claims that the proposed project would impact plants and animals. The project site is an urban infill site and there are no sensitive, threatened or endangered plant and animal species present. The analysis conducted for DEIR 2005 concluded that there would be not significant impacts to biological resources after mitigation.

P-29-8

Please refer to Responses to Comments L-1-4 and L-1-5.

P-29-9

Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-15.

P-29-10

This comment urges the City to approve a less dense project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

CHARLES AND JUDY COURDY

P-30-1

The commenters oppose the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-30-2

This comment states that traffic in the project area is congested. Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 summarizes the existing operating conditions at 11 intersections within the project vicinity, estimates the trip generation potential of the proposed project, and forecasts future intersection operating conditions at completion and occupancy of the project. An evaluation of the project's access, on-site circulation, and parking needs as well as a qualitative neighborhood street analysis is also provided.

P-30-3

This comment suggests preserving open space and wetlands. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

DENIS CRAIG (ISLAND VILLAGE HOA COMMUNITY AFFAIRS LIAISON)

P-31-1

This comment states that the residents of the Community of Island Village have strong concerns about the analysis of project impacts related to soil contamination, air pollution, traffic congestion, police services, noise abatement, and pedestrian access. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA analysis in DEIR 2005 will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

KATHLEEN AND WILLIAM CRAWFORD (JUNE 13, 2005, A)

P-32-1

The commenter believes DEIR 2005 is deficient and inadequate. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA analysis in DEIR 2005 will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-32-2

This comment states that DEIR 2005 did not adequately address existing traffic problems (including Loynes Drive) or cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed project and Seaport Marina. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive and Common Response 2: Seaport Marina.

P-32-3

Please refer to responses to comments L-1-4 and L-1-5.

P-32-4

The commenter is concerned about the possibility of sewage spilling into the Los Cerritos Channel. Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-14. In addition, the commenter erroneously states that DEIR 2005 says that the project will have no impact on the wetlands. DEIR 2005 states that the proposed project will have a *less than significant* impact on the Los Cerritos Wetlands. The project site is currently developed with industrial uses and is separated from the Los Cerritos wetlands by a major arterial (Studebaker Road). Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse effects to the Los Cerritos Wetlands from project sources such as traffic, light, and noise. These sources already exist and are not expected to increase substantially. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

P-32-5

This comment states that projected tax revenue is overstated. The comment also states that due to business competition, there may be failure among new or existing businesses. As a general rule, an EIR is required to evaluate only the physical environment impacts of a project, and economic effects that are not related to physical impacts need not be evaluated in an EIR. Business failures, tax revenue, business competition and forecasts are outside the purview of an EIR. Without evidence of a physical impact related to these issues, no further response is required. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about environmental effects in the DEIR 2005 or the environmental analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-32-6

The commenter requests a critical evaluation of development alternatives for the proposed project site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

KATHLEEN AND WILLIAM CRAWFORD (JUNE 13, 2005, B)

P-33-1

Please refer to Response to Comment P-32-1.

P-33-2

Please refer to Response to Comment P-32-2.

P-33-3

Please refer to Response to Comment P-32-3.

P-33-4

Please refer to Response to Comment P-32-4.

P-33-5

Please refer to Response to Comment P-32-5.

P-33-6

Please refer to Response to Comment P-32-6.

LEON CRAWFORD

P-34-1

The commenter questions the need for the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-34-2

The commenter states that the City wasted money on the EIR. No City funds were used in preparation of the EIR. The project applicant bears the cost of preparation of all environmental analysis.

P-34-3

The commenter agrees with the conclusions in the DEIR regarding air quality and traffic. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA analysis in DEIR 2005 will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-34-4

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-34-5

The comment asks if the Boeing development was included in the cumulative traffic impact analysis. As stated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005, two cumulative projects were identified in the cumulative condition based on discussions with the City of Long Beach and City of Seal Beach Planning Departments: (1) 120 Studebaker Road, and (2) the Boeing Specific Plan. Project trip generation for both approved/pending projects was provided by the City of Long Beach and City of Seal Beach Planning Departments. In addition, the cumulative traffic analysis in the Recirculated Draft EIR includes the proposed Seaport Marina.

P-34-6

Refer to Common Response 4: Terrorist Threat.

P-34-7

This comment questions whether potential impacts to the Los Cerritos Wetlands were considered. Potential impacts to the Los Cerritos Wetlands were evaluated in Section 4.3 of DEIR 2005. As stated on page 4.3-9, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse effects to the Los Cerritos Wetlands from project sources such as traffic, light, and noise. These sources already exist and are not expected to increase substantially. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

P-34-8

This comment questions whether the project will result in an opportunity for increased crime. Potential impacts to police services were evaluated in section 4.10 of DEIR 2005. The City of Long Beach Police Department recommended that Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) guidelines be applied during final site plan refinement to reduce potential increases in demand for police services. In addition, Mitigation Measure 4.10.3 requires implementation of a Security Plan to reduce project impacts to police services. According to the mitigation measure, the Security Plan will include all of the following:

- Interior and exterior security lighting
- Alarm systems
- Locking doors for all employee locations
- Use of vines and other landscaping to discourage graffiti and unauthorized access
- Bonded security guards
- “No Loitering” signs posted at various locations throughout the project site
- Surveillance cameras for each business and all on-site parking areas
- Surveillance cameras located on site that are capable of thoroughly monitoring Channel View Park, the Vista Street/Loynes Drive intersection, and the Vista Street/Silvera Avenue intersection

Please note that Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005 was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Please refer to section 4.3 of the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-34-9

This comment concludes the comment letter and does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein. Therefore, no further response is necessary.

MARGARET SAUCEDA CURWEN

P-35-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-35-2

The comment states that the proposed project will result in more congestion to Studebaker. Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 addresses traffic and circulation impacts of the proposed project and the cumulative impacts of the proposed Home Depot and Seaport Marina projects were evaluated in the Recirculated Draft EIR. The project applicant has agreed to construct improvements that will enhance traffic flow and safety within the study area, including synchronized traffic lights. In addition to improvements the applicant has agreed to construct, the City of Long Beach will require implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.11.1 through 4.11.9. Even with implementation of these mitigation measures, the proposed project will result in significant impacts to the following intersections:

Weekday Peak Hour

- Studebaker Road/SR-22 westbound ramps
- Studebaker Road/SR-22 eastbound ramps (with Seaport Marina added)

Weekend Midday Peak Hour

- PCH/7th Street
- PCH/2nd Street

Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-35-3

The commenter states that the area is adequately covered by home improvement businesses. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-35-4

The commenter supports building a park of the project site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-35-5

The commenter opposes the proposed project and suggests restoring wetlands on the project site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

THOMAS CURWEN

P-36-1

Please refer to Response to Comment P-35-1.

P-36-2

Please refer to Response to Comments P-35-2.

P-36-3

Please refer to Response to Comment P-35-3.

P-36-4

Please refer to Response to Comment P-35-4.

P-36-5

Please refer to Response to Comment P-35-5.

JANICE DAHL (JUNE 12, 2005)

P-37-1

This comment urges others to submit written letters objecting to the proposed project. The comment erroneously states that only those who submit written comments on DEIR 2005 will be allowed to participate in the Planning Commission Hearing. Members of the public who wish to make a public comment at the Planning Commission Hearing will be allowed to speak, pursuant to City of Long Beach rules of conduct for public hearings. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-37-2

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive

P-37-3

Refer to Common Response 2: Seaport Marina, and Responses to Comments O-3-4 and O-3-5.

P-37-4

Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-6.

P-37-5

Please refer to responses to comments O-3-7 and O-3-8.

P-37-6

Please refer to responses to comments O-3-9 and O-3-10.

P-37-7

Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-11.

P-37-8

Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-12.

P-37-9

Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-13.

P-37-10

Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-14.

P-37-11

Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-15.

P-37-12

Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-16.

P-37-13

Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-17.

P-37-14

This comment contains list of recipients of the comment letter. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

GRACE DAVIES

P-38-1

The comment consists of an introduction to the comment letter. The commenters oppose the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA process will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-38-2

Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-2.

P-38-3

Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-3.

P-38-4

Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-4.

P-38-5

Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-5.

P-38-6

The comment concludes the comment letter. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

CHRISTY DAVIS

P-39-1

The commenter opposes new traffic lights Studebaker, 2nd Street, and Westminster. The project does not propose new signals; the project proposes coordinated signal timing. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-39-2

The commenter opposes restaurants and coffee bar tenants. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-39-3

The commenter states that development of downtown Long Beach did not consider traffic impacts in the Naples/Belmont Shore area. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-39-4

The commenter would support development of a Home Depot Expo Center more than a Design Center. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-39-5

The commenter suggests an open design on the proposed site with a limited number of businesses to reduce traffic impacts. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-39-6

This comment concludes the comment letter. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

MR. & MRS. JAMES L. DENISON

P-40-1

This comment supports approval of the No Development/No Build Alternative. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-40-2

This comment misquotes the EIR. The EIR states that a jurisdictional delineation, conducted on July 2, 2004, identified the limits of both potential Corps and CDFG jurisdictions associated with a small portion of the Los Cerritos Channel just north of the Loynes Drive Bridge because this is the area where the proposed sewer line extension would be attached to the bridge. *This portion* of the Los Cerritos Channel contains open water year-round but does not appear to support any wetland habitat. As stated in DEIR 2005 on page 4.3-9, no sensitive plant species were observed during any of the surveys or are expected to occur on the project site because of lack of suitable habitat.

The EIR also states that implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse effects to the Los Cerritos Wetlands from project sources such as traffic, light, and noise. These sources already exist and are not expected to increase substantially. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

P-40-3

The commenter finds the air quality impacts disclosed in the EIR to be unacceptable. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-40-4

Refer to Common Response 4: Threat of Terrorist Attack.

P-40-5

Refer to Common Response 2: Seaport Marina and Response to Comment P-129-113.

P-40-6

The commenter states that coordinating traffic signals and lane restriping will not mitigate adverse project impacts. As stated in DEIR 2005, impacts to three intersections cannot be mitigated below a level of significance. In addition, the cumulative analysis in the Recirculated Draft EIR found one additional significant and unavoidable impact. These intersections are:

Weekday Peak Hour

- Studebaker Road/SR-22 westbound ramps
- Studebaker Road/SR-22 eastbound ramps (with Seaport Marina added)

Weekend Midday Peak Hour

- PCH/7th Street
- PCH/2nd Street

P-40-7

The commenter finds the air quality and traffic impacts disclosed in the EIR to be unacceptable. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-40-8

The commenter erroneously states that no alternatives uses for the site presented in DEIR 2005 and suggests a solar energy-producing facility be built on the project site. Project alternatives were discussed in Chapter 6.0 of DEIR 2005. Alternatives to the proposed project that were considered in DEIR 2005 are outlined below.

- **No Project/No Development:** This alternative would involve no changes to the existing conditions of the project site
- **Reduced Project Alternative:** The Reduced Project Alternative consists of a home improvement store with no other retail uses on the site, a reduction in developed area of 18,000 square feet (139,529) square feet versus 157,529 square feet for the proposed project
- **Warehouse Alternative:** This alternative consists of developing the site with a warehouse, consistent with the industrial zoning of the property
- **Light Industrial Alternative:** The light industrial use considers development of the site with uses such as printing plants, material testing laboratories, assembly of data processing equipment, and power stations

Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-40-9

This comment reiterates the commenter's support for the No Development/No Build Alternative. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

ERIC EISMANN

P-41-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-41-2

The comment states that the proposed project would increase traffic. As disclosed in DEIR 2005, the net trip generation for the proposed project is approximately 5,783 average daily weekday trips, 239 a.m. peak-hour weekday trips, 422 p.m. peak-hour weekday trips, and 952 peak-hour weekend trips. Impacts to three intersections cannot be mitigated below a level of significance. These intersections are:

Weekday Peak Hour

- Studebaker Road/SR-22 westbound ramps

Weekend Midday Peak Hour

- PCH/7th Street
- PCH/2nd Street

P-41-3

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-41-4

The comment states that employee parking should be located at the nearest MTA station and shuttle buses should be mandated for all construction workers. Parking requirements for the proposed project are established in the City of Long Beach Zoning Ordinance. The City Zoning Ordinance includes regulations concerning where and under what conditions a business may operate in the City of Long Beach. It also establishes zone-specific height limits, setback requirements, parking ratios, and other development standards. In order to comply with the Long Beach Zoning Ordinance, the proposed project must provide on-site parking at ratios established in the Ordinance.

P-41-5

Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-41-6

The comment requests information regarding the availability of alternative forms of transportation, including bicycle access and pedestrian access. As stated in DEIR 2005, the project applicant has agreed to construct improvements that will enhance traffic flow and safety within the study area, including the following improvement, which relates to alternative modes of transportation:

1. In conjunction with and upon approval by the City Public Works Director, design and construct pedestrian access across the Loynes Drive Bridge west of Studebaker Road. This will provide convenient accessible, (i.e., ADA) pedestrian access from the adjacent residential area to the proposed neighborhood shops and restaurants.

In addition, the project site is currently serviced by the Orange County Transportation Agency's (OCTA) transit service, which includes bus stops (Routes 1 and 60) located along northbound and southbound Studebaker Road adjacent to the intersection of Studebaker Road/Loynes Drive. These stops are delineated with a sign only; there are no bus turnouts. Long Beach Transit (LBT) does not currently provide service adjacent to the project site.

P-41-7

The comment suggests that Home Depot charge for parking to encourage use of alternative modes of transportation. Parking requirements for the proposed project are established in the City of Long Beach Zoning Ordinance. The City Zoning Ordinance includes regulations concerning where and under what conditions a business may operate in the City of Long Beach. It also establishes zone-specific height limits, setback requirements, parking ratios, and other development standards. The City's minimum parking requirement for a commercial shopping center (Home Depot and retail pads) is 5 spaces per 1,000 square feet, with an additional 2 spaces per 1,000 square feet for the garden center. The minimum requirement for detached fast-food restaurant uses is 10 spaces per 1,000 square feet. Based on the project site plan, approximately 585 parking spaces would be required for the shopping center, 70 parking spaces would be required for the garden center, and 60 parking spaces would be required for the restaurant, for a total of 715 required parking spaces. If the project applicant were to provide less parking than required by the City Zoning Ordinance, a Standards Variance would be required. Although the project applicant may implement programs to encourage employees to use alternative forms of transportation, reducing on-site parking would not be in accordance with existing municipal standards and requirements.

P-41-8

The comment states that the health impact of the incremental stress cause by the Project over the no-build alternative should be considered. Although CEQA requires analysis of the potential health impacts of the project, this analysis is balanced with the general rule that EIRs should evaluate foreseeable, but not speculative impacts. Analysis of the health impacts of stress caused by the proposed project is too speculative for evaluation.

P-41-9

The comment requests that the City of Long Beach study the relationship between traffic congestion and road rage, such as freeway shootings, and deny the project if a link is found. Physical impacts

related to traffic and circulation are evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. As a general rule, an EIR is required to evaluate only the environment impacts of a project, and social effects (e.g., road rage) that are not related to physical impacts need not be evaluated in an EIR. In addition, the link between traffic congestion and road rage would be speculative and therefore beyond the scope of CEQA analysis.

P-41-10

The comment states that increased vehicular noise associated with the proposed project may affect the ability of children to learn at Kettering Elementary School. As shown in Table 4 of the Recirculated Draft EIR, the proposed project would increase the traffic noise levels along Studebaker Road and East 7th Street, within the vicinity of Kettering Elementary School, by 0.6 and 0.1 dBA, respectively. These increases in noise level are less than the 3 dBA threshold of change that is perceptible to the average human ear within an outdoor environment. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant traffic noise impact on the existing Kettering Elementary School. No mitigation measures are required.

P-41-11

The comment states that the project applicant should monitor noise at Kettering Elementary School throughout the construction period and upgrade the entire school's noise insulation capacity if there is a single even that exceed the noise threshold. Construction activities that are conducted between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. on weekdays are exempt from the City's interior and exterior noise standards. Therefore, if construction is limited to the hours specified, noise generated during construction will not result in a significant impact. There are no standards against which the results of noise monitoring could be compared.

P-41-12

The comment states that the project will contribute to concentrations of air pollutants resulting from construction and vehicle emissions in the project area. The potential air quality impacts of the proposed project including those related to concentrations of air pollutants resulting from construction and vehicle emissions in the project area are discussed in detail in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005.

P-41-13

The comment states that diesel motors should not idle for more than 10-minutes. According to the California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Chapter 10 - Mobile Source Operational Controls, Section 2485, on or after February 1, 2005, the driver of any vehicle with gross vehicular weight ratings of greater than 10,000 pounds that are or must be licensed for operation on highways:

- 1) shall not idle the vehicle's primary diesel engine for greater than 5.0 minutes at any location, except as noted in Subsection (d); and
- 2) shall not operate a diesel-fueled auxiliary power system (APS) to power a heater, air conditioner, or any ancillary equipment on that vehicle during sleeping or resting in a sleeper

berth for greater than 5.0 minutes at any location when within 100 feet of a restricted area, except as noted in Subsection (d).

See the full text of the rule at www.arb.ca.gov/toxics/idling/regtext.htm.

The health risk modeling documented in the responses to comments R-R-1-4 thru R-R-1-9 show that an idling period of 15 minutes was used. This is based on the SCAQMD's position that typical truck trips include more than one idling event (idle while waiting for a dock, idle at the dock before unloading/loading, idle at the dock after unloading/loading). While all idling events may not occur each trip and a full five minutes of idling may not occur during each idling event, SCAQMD staff recommends using 15 minutes of idling per trip to represent the standard delivery truck trip.

P-41-14

The comment requests that the developer study the relationship between electric vehicles and clean air and use only electric vehicles is cleaner air results from their use. The purpose of an EIR is to provide public agencies and the public with detailed information about the effects a project is likely to have on the environment, to list ways significant effects might be minimized, and to indicate alternatives to the project. DEIR identified significant unavoidable impacts related to air quality including short-term construction air quality impacts (NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions), long-term operational air quality impacts (CO, ROC, NO_x) associated with vehicular trip-related emissions, and cumulative air quality impacts. Although use of electric vehicles may reduce vehicle emissions associated with the proposed project, the limited availability of electric vehicles (especially electric construction vehicles) makes this an infeasible mitigation measure which need not be discussed under CEQA.

P-41-15

The comment requests that potential impacts for nighttime lighting be analyzed. The potential impacts of light and glare are addressed in Section 4.1 of DEIR 2005. As stated on page 4.1-16 of DEIR 2005, photometric analysis of project lighting available for review at the City of Long Beach Department of Planning and Building shows that spill light is reduced to a maximum of 0.3 fc at 50 feet from the project boundary and a maximum of 0.1 fc at 100 feet from the project boundary. Mitigation Measures 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 are precautionary measures intended to further prevent any potentially adverse impacts from spill light or glare. With incorporation of these measures, any potentially significant impacts from spill light and glare generated by the proposed project are reduced to below a level of significance.

P-41-16

The comment requests analysis of the negative impacts that the proposed project may have on the surrounding community in relation to crime rates. Physical impacts related to the provision of police protection services were evaluated in Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005 and Mitigation Measure 4.10.3 requires implementation of a Security Plan, approved by the City of Long Beach Chief of Police, prior to issuance of any certificates of occupancy. In addition, the public services and utilities analysis was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. As a general rule, an EIR is required to evaluate only the environment impacts of a project, and social effects (e.g., crime rates) that are not

related to physical impacts need not be evaluated in an EIR. In addition, the link between the proposed project and area crime rates would be speculative and therefore beyond the scope of required CEQA analysis.

P-41-17

The comment requests that Neighborhood Compatibility Program be established to develop and maintain landscaped buffers around the project site. Setbacks for the proposed project are established in the City of Long Beach Zoning Ordinance. The City Zoning Ordinance includes regulations concerning where and under what conditions a business may operate in the City of Long Beach. It also establishes zone-specific height limits, setback requirements, parking ratios, and other development standards. The proposed project includes a 45-foot landscaped setback along Studebaker Road. The streetscape will include areas of turf with a variety of grasses, perennials, flowering shrubs, and groundcovers bisected with a meandering walkway to encourage community interaction within outdoor plazas and plantings. It appears that these existing requirements function as the requested buffer. The comment does not contain any further environmental concerns or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein. Therefore, no further response is necessary.

P-41-18

The comment requests that a relocation assistance/property acquisition program be established to help residents move away from the area if health impacts result from the proposed project. As described in Section 4.6 of DEIR 2005, implementation of mitigation measures will reduce potential project-related hazards and hazardous materials impacts to less than significant levels. Additionally, project design and other mitigation substantially lessen environmental effects of the project. Economic implications and effects on property values are not required to be addressed in an EIR where there is no evidence that physical impacts will occur directly or indirectly to the physical environment. Therefore, there is no need for additional mitigation.

P-41-19

The comment suggests that historic education materials on the project area be developed and distributed prior to project implementation. The comment also suggests that a Historic/Cultural Center, to be paid for by the project applicant, be located on the project site. As stated in Section 4.4 of DEIR 2005, impacts to the archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources of the project area will be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.4.1 and 4.4.2. There is no evidence provided to connect the proposed project to any impact that would require such mitigation. Therefore, there is no need for additional mitigation.

P-41-20

The comment suggests that surface oil wells be replaced with subsurface oil wells. There are no oil wells on the project site. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-41-21

The comment states that the project should adhere to the Cultural Affairs Departments. The City of Long Beach does not have a Cultural Affairs Department. The City of Long Beach has a Historic Preservation Officer and a Cultural Heritage Commission. In consultation with the Historic Preservation Officer, a cultural resource survey of the project area conducted on Feb. 20, 2004 by LSA Associates, Inc. A Cultural Resources Assessment (LSA 2004) was reviewed by the Historic Preservation Officer and used in the preparation of DEIR 2005 and the recommended mitigation. The project applicant will be required to comply with Mitigation Measures 4.4.1 and 4.4.2 and conditions of approval adopted by the City of Long Beach.

P-41-22

The comment states that the project should be required to adopt a recycling program. Mitigation Measure 4.10.1 requires the development and implementation of a Solid Waste Management Plan for the proposed project. Mitigation Measure 4.10.2 requires that adequate storage space for the collection and loading of recyclable materials be included in the design of buildings. Please refer to Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005 or Section 4.3 of the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-41-23

The comment suggests that the proposed project study evacuation routes available to the neighborhood in the event of a terrorist attack or natural disaster and that the project fund disaster shelters. Evacuation routes can vary depending upon the type, location, and duration of the emergency. It is not a function of this CEQA analysis to determine what types of evacuation routes would be utilized for terrorist attacks, natural disasters or other types of emergencies. Any type of emergency or disaster would require specific action at the time of occurrence to determine the best course, either stay in place or evacuate, and those types of decisions are made by safety personnel with the public interest in mind.

P-41-24

The comment suggests that City of Long Beach and Los Angeles County residents be given hiring priority over Orange County residents. Hiring practices will be determined by retail tenants in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-41-25

The comment suggests that every building on the project site should meet U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold-level. The City of Long Beach has a Green Building Policy. The U.S. Green Building Council's LEED Rating System and Reference Guide are used to determine what constitutes sustainable building under this policy. LEED provides four award levels based on the number of environmentally related points achieved by a new building project. The City of Long Beach has set a policy goal of LEED Silver (the second highest award level) for all new municipal construction projects. This policy does not apply to non-municipal projects. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-41-26

The comment suggests that a construction noise program be developed to provide feasible measures to reduce significant construction noise. As stated in Section 4.9 of DEIR 2005, implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.9.1 and 4.9.2 will reduce potential project impacts related to traffic noise and construction noise to a less than significant level. All other potential project impacts related to noise are less than significant. Therefore, there is no need for additional mitigation.

P-41-27

The comment suggests that operation of construction equipment be limited to 10:00 am to 3:00 pm, Monday through Friday. Construction hours are set by the City of Long Beach Noise Control Ordinance. Furthermore, noise generated by construction activities between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturday are exempted from the Noise Control Ordinance standards. Therefore, if construction is limited to the hours specified, noise generated during construction will not result in a significant impact and no further mitigation is necessary. Adherence to the Noise Control Ordinance is required by Mitigation Measure 4.8.2.

P-41-28

The comment requests that Construction Coordination Office be established during construction activities to response to complaints and questions from the community. Such a measure is not required to mitigate any documented impact. The suggestion will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for consideration.

P-41-29

The comment suggests that project plans should be reviewed at the local, State, and federal level. The City of Long Beach is the Lead Agency for the proposed project under CEQA. The Long Beach Police Department has reviewed and submitted comments on the proposed project. State and federal review of project plans are not necessary nor are they required by any ordinance or regulation.

P-41-30

The comment suggests that the proposed project study the relationship between the project and the security threat to the nearby refinery. There is no a refinery adjacent to the project site. There are three electric generating plants – two operated by AES Alamos, LLC and one operated by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. Refer to Common Response 4: Threat of Terrorist Attack.

P-41-31

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project. This comment concludes the comment letter. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

REIKO EISMANN

P-42-1

The comment expresses concern regarding terrorist attacks and requests that a firm specializing in threat assessment study the proposed project. There is no refinery adjacent to the project site. There are three electric generating plants – two operated by AES Alamos, LLC and one operated by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. Refer to Common Response 4: Threat of Terrorist Attack.

P-42-2

Please refer to Response to Comment P-41-16.

P-42-3

The commenter requests a study of current traffic violation statistics for the area and a comparison of those statistics with an area that has a high percentage of out-of-area drivers. Although CEQA requires analysis of the potential impacts to police services of the project, this analysis is balanced with the general rule that EIRs should evaluate foreseeable, but not speculative impacts. Analysis of the impacts related to police services based on the presence of out-of-area drivers is too speculative for evaluation.

P-42-4

Please refer to Response to Comment P-42-3. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

PATTY FIDANZA

P-43-1

The commenter erroneously implies that the project site is a wetland. No potential jurisdictional wetlands were identified at the project site or within the portion of the Los Cerritos Channel near the proposed sewer line construction. Therefore, potential impacts to jurisdictional wetlands as a result of the proposed project are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

P-43-2

The commenter opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

DEIDRA FIG-CROWD

P-44-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. Please refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive and Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

BELINDA FREETH

P-45-1

The comment is an email transmittal. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-45-2

The commenter opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-45-3

The comment provides an observation about traffic congestion in project area. Potential impacts related to the traffic and circulation were address in section 4.11 of DEIR 2005.

P-45-4

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-45-5

The comment states that the proposed project will contribute to air quality impacts. Potential air quality impacts were analyzed in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005.

P-45-6

The comment states that the project will contribute to increasing noise levels. Potential noise impacts were evaluated in Section 4.9 of DEIR 2005.

P-45-7

Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic

P-45-8

Refer to Common Response 2: Seaport Marina

P-45-9

The comment refers to the project as a “toxic construction site” and expresses concern about contaminated fugitive dust. The project site will be remediated prior to the initiation of construction activities with oversight by DTSC. Refer to Responses to Comments S-1-2, S-1-5, S-1-6, and S-1-16.

P-45-10

The comment expresses concern regarding the proposed on-site sewage system. The proposed project includes the replacement of 265 feet of existing 8-inch public sewer with 10-inch sewer in Vista Street between Daroca Street and Margo Street and the replacement of 261 feet of 8-inch sewer with a 10-inch diameter sewer between the manhole at Daroca and Vista Street and the first manhole in the Golf Course. The Project Description and Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005 were revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information regarding the proposed improvements to the public sewer system.

P-45-11

The comment states that the proposed project is not consistent with the goals stated in the City's 2010 Strategic Plan. As stated in Section 4.8 of DEIR 2005, the project will enhance the economic vitality of the City of Long Beach by transitioning a site from Brownfield to commercial retail center. The project site does not currently contribute to the economic base of the City or provide retail amenities to the community or local businesses. The proposed project will directly contribute to business development, job creation, the revitalization of aging areas, and infill development which is consistent with the Economic Development Goals stated in the 2010 Strategic Plan.

P-45-12

The comment is a quote from the City's 2010 Strategic Plan related to preservation of wetlands. As stated in Section 4.3 of DEIR 2005, no potential jurisdictional wetlands were identified on the project site or within the portion of the Los Cerritos Channel near the proposed sewer line construction.

P-45-13

The commenter believes that the City of Long Beach should recognize the long-term benefits of attracting middle and high income jobs. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-45-14

The commenter opposes the proposed project because she believes that it will adversely affect individuals living in the area. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-45-15

The commenter supports a project that offers high-income jobs with 9:00 to 5:00 offices hours, no weekend activity, and a better sewage disposal infrastructure and construction mitigation plan. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any

substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

RALPH FREITAG

P-46-1

The commenter supports approval of the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

DOROTHY GEISLER

P-47-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project because of the potential air quality and traffic impacts. Potential traffic impacts were addressed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 and potential air quality impacts were addressed in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-47-2

The comment question who is reading the comment letters submitted in response to the EIR. Responses to comments received on the EIR will be reviewed by City staff. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-47-3

The comment is a question about wetlands on the project site. As stated in Section 4.3 of DEIR 2005, no potential jurisdictional wetlands were identified on the project site or within the portion of the Los Cerritos Channel near the proposed sewer line construction.

DEBRA RAMSEY GILBERT

P-48-1

The comment is an email transmittal. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-48-2

The comment is introductory. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-48-3

The commenter opines that the consultant team who prepared DEIR 2005 did not recognize or minimizes the potential impacts to the surrounding neighborhood, the Los Cerritos Wetlands and traffic in the summer months. DEIR 2005 was prepared in accordance with CEQA (PRC § 21000—21178) and the State CEQA Guidelines (CCR § 15000—15378). Impacts to the surround neighborhoods were addressed throughout Chapter 4.0, potential impacts to the Los Cerritos Wetlands were address in Section 4.3, and potential traffic impacts were addressed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005.

P-48-4

The comment states that the EIR should have evaluated the potential impacts of the proposed project on long-term restoration of the Los Cerritos Wetlands. The project site is currently developed with industrial uses and is separated from the Los Cerritos wetlands by a major arterial (Studebaker Road). Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse effects to the Los Cerritos Wetlands from project sources such as traffic, light, and noise. These sources already exist and are not expected to increase substantially. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required. DEIR 2005 does include mitigation to prevent any incidental discharge of fill, debris, or other material into the Los Cerritos Channel and the two adjacent water supply channels.

P-48-5

The comment states that mitigation should be identified for the three intersections potentially impacted by project development. It is unclear from the comment which three intersection the commenter is referencing. DEIR 2005 identified mitigation for project impacts to the intersections at Studebaker and 2nd Street and Studebaker and Loynes. Due to right-of-way constraints, there are no feasible improvements at the intersections of PCH and 7th Street, PCH and 2nd Street, and the Studebaker Road and SR-22 westbound and eastbound ramps. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-48-6

The comment states that mitigation listed in DEIR 2005 should be measurable to allow monitoring of their implementation. Please refer to Chapter 7.0 of DEIR 2005 and the Recirculated Draft EIR, which contain the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the proposed project. All

mitigation measures contained in DEIR 2005 set forth in the EIR are enforceable, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines.

P-48-7

The comment states that DEIR 2005 did not contain a fiscal impact analysis. Physical impacts related to the provision of police and fire protection service and other public services were evaluated in Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005. In addition, the public services and utilities analysis was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. As a general rule, an EIR is required to evaluate only the environment impacts of a project, and economic effects that are not related to physical impacts need not be evaluated in an EIR. Refer to Response to Comment P-3-9.

P-48-8

Refer to Common Response 2: Seaport Marina.

P-48-9

The comment erroneously states that analysis of cut-through traffic in University Park Estates was begun the second week of June. The cut-through neighborhood analysis was conducted during March 2005, not the second week of June. The University and Kettering Elementary School were in session during this time. Based on the timed surveys, the weekend surveys showed that the direct routes are significantly faster than the cut-through routes. Therefore, there is no incentive to use cut-through routes. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-48-10

This comment states that DEIR 2005 did not state when data collection took place. As stated on page 4.11-1, the information contained in that section was based on the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. (LSA) in January 2005. On page 4.11-4 of DEIR 2005, it states that City provided weekday peak-period intersection turn volumes for four study area intersections. Southland Car Counters collected the remaining weekday peak-hour intersection turn volumes in January 2004 and collected weekend peak-hour (midday) traffic counts in July 2004. For additional information refer to Appendix J of DEIR 2005 or the Recirculated Draft EIR.

P-48-11

The comment states that the traffic analysis does not reflect higher traffic periods in June, July, and August. Weekday peak-hour (commuting periods) traffic counts were collected in January 2004. Weekend peak-hour (midday) traffic counts were collected in July 2004. Refer to Response to Comment P-48-10.

P-48-12

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-48-13

The comment requests the location of the three stores used to establish pass by reduction in the Barton-Aschman Associates study and as to whether they are located in beach communities. This study referred to locations in Orange, Santa Ana, and North Hollywood. As discussed in DEIR 2005, pass-by trips represent vehicles traveling along Studebaker Road that would stop at the project site on the way to their destination. So these trips were not considered when the trip generation for the proposed project was calculated. It is irrelevant whether or not the site is located in a beach community.

P-48-14

Please refer to Response to Comment P-48-13.

P-48-15

The comment request identification of the beach-community Home Depots used to gather sales demand per hour data. Please refer to Response to Comment P-48-13.

P-48-16

The comment disagrees with the weekend peak hour used to evaluate weekend traffic impacts in DEIR 2005. The weekend peak hour was based on weekend traffic counts. Opinions regarding the analysis in the EIR will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-48-17

The comment requests the “time frame” used to establish pass by reduction in the Barton-Aschman Associates study. The study was conducted during normal hours of operation, typically 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.

P-48-18

The comment states that the City of Long Beach may not reach an agreement with Caltrans regarding traffic mitigation and that an agreement needs to be in place prior to project approval. It is unclear what traffic mitigation requires approval from Caltrans. Mitigation Measures 4.11.1 through 4.11.3 require the approval of the City of Long Beach. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-48-19

The comment states that the EIR did not provide reviewers with the ability to evaluate how the area will look with project lighting at night. As stated in Section 4.1, photometric analysis of project lighting available for review at the City of Long Beach Department of Planning and Building shows that spill light is reduced to a maximum of 0.3 fc at 50 feet from the project boundary and a maximum of 0.1 fc at 100 feet from the project boundary. Mitigation Measures 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 are precautionary measures intended to further prevent any potentially adverse impacts from spill light or glare. With

incorporation of these measures, any potentially significant impacts from spill light and glare generated by the proposed project are reduced to below a level of significance.

P-48-20

The comment states that concerns of residents regarding cumulative aesthetics impacts are dismissed. Analysis of cumulative aesthetics impacts was provided in Section 4.1 on page 4.1-16.

P-48-21

The comment erroneously states that Mitigation Measure 4.2.1, 4.6.1, and 4.6.5 do not state who will monitor implementation. Mitigation Measure 4.2.1 states that the City of Long Beach Building Official shall verify that construction plans include a statement stipulating that the construction contractor shall be responsible for compliance with applicable SCAQMD Rules and Regulations. It would be a violation of the construction contract if applicable SCAQMD rules are not adhered to during construction. Mitigation Measure 4.6.1 states that the city of Long Beach Fire Department shall oversee and monitor the demolition of Tanks Nos. 1–4 and 6 and associated pipeline conveyance systems in accordance with local, State, and federal requirements. Mitigation Measure 4.6.5 states that methane mitigation design and the methane soil gas investigation workplan will be approved by the Long Beach Fire Department.

P-48-22

The comment erroneously states the DEIR 2005 suggested that changes to the proposed project site will not affect biological resources 1000 yards away. The analysis contained in DEIR 2005 was based on a *Biological Constraints Analysis, Burrowing Owl Breeding Season Survey Report*, and a *Jurisdictional Delineation* and includes potential impacts to both the project site and the cumulative study area.

P-48-23

The comment states that DEIR 2005 minimizes the distance between the project site and Kettering Elementary with regard to methane. Methane is the main constituent in natural gas, occurs naturally in oil reservoirs and is produced by the bacterial breakdown (i.e., biodegradation) of crude oil and other organic materials. “In the United States, the largest methane emissions come from the decomposition of wastes in landfills, ruminant digestion and manure management associated with domestic livestock, natural gas and oil systems, and coal mining. Natural wetlands are responsible for approximately 76% of global methane emissions from natural sources.”¹ Methane is regulated by the City of Long Beach Fire Department because it is flammable, explosive, and can build up in buildings and cause asphyxiation; therefore, it is a potential hazard for the site. For this reason, Mitigation Measure 4.6.8 requires implementation of a Soil and Air Monitoring Program for all soil-disturbance activities so that appropriate venting measures can be implemented if methane is found at an explosive level. Mitigation Measure 4.6.7 requires a detailed methane investigation after rough grading so that appropriate venting systems can be designed for the buildings if required.

¹ www.epa.gov/methane/sources_html

P-48-24

The comment suggests than an agency outside the City of Long Beach should be responsible for review and implementation of the methane soil gas investigation. The City of Long Beach Fire Department has jurisdiction over combustible gases such as methane. DTSC, however, will oversee remediation of the project site and will therefore be involved in review and approval of the detailed soil gas investigation.

P-48-25

The comment states that concerns of residents regarding hazards and hazardous waste impacts are dismissed, the list of unknowns is long, and that there are many mitigation measures. The Phase I Environmental Assessment Report prepared for the project (Appendix F of DEIR 2005) discloses the known and potential hazardous materials at the site. The known and potential hazardous materials are consistent with the site's past use as a tank farm. Mitigation measures have been provided that require compliance with regulations for remediation of hazardous materials at a site within California. DTSC will provide oversight of site remediation to ensure that hazardous materials removal is conducted in accordance with applicable regulations. Refer to Responses to Comments S-1-2, S-1-5, S-1-6, and S-1-11.

P-48-26

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-48-27

Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-48-28

Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-48-29

The comment states that a thorough analysis is needed to determine if the local residents want a commercial Home Improvement Store. DEIR 2005 was prepared in accordance with CEQA (PRC § 21000—21178) and the State CEQA Guidelines (CCR § 15000—15378) and as such is intended to evaluate environmental impacts associated with the proposed Home Depot project. It is not the purpose of a CEQA document to analyze public opinion regarding a proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-48-30

The comment erroneously states that the alternatives analysis needs to explore all 11 sites available for development in the City of Long Beach. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need to be considered for inclusion in the EIR.

The principal component of the proposed project is a home improvement store. Secondary components of the project are supporting, freestanding commercial uses. According to the project proponent, the minimum site size for a home improvement store is approximately 11 acres. Home Depot, the project proponent, has identified southeast Long Beach as its market area. The siting requirements identified by the proponent are sites east of Ximeno Avenue and south of Atherton Street. Of the 11 sites identified on the City's map of vacant land with development potential, only the Los Cerritos Wetlands site is in the market area identified by Home Depot. Given the limitations imposed by the Coastal Act and the constraints associated with development of coastal wetlands, the use of the Los Cerritos Wetlands as an alternative site for the proposed project is considered infeasible. For additional information, please refer to Chapter 6.0 of DEIR 2005.

P-48-31

The comment expresses an opinion about the need for compromise between the land owner and local residents. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or project development will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

DON GILL (JUNE 6, 2005)

P-49-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-49-2

The comment is an opinion about the negative impacts of the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-49-3

The commenter would prefer a public storage or light industrial complex to the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-49-4

The comment states that traffic would adversely affect Studebaker Road and Loynes Drive and pose security risk. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive and Response to Comment O-2-11.

P-49-5

The commenter believes that the project will compromise the lives and safety of surrounding neighborhoods. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-49-6

The commenter opposes the project and urges the City to deny project development. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

DON GILL (APRIL 14, 2005)

P-50-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-50-2

The comment states that the proposed project would be accessed from Studebaker Road only. Access to the proposed project would be provided via two right-turn in/out access driveways on Studebaker Road and at the signalized intersection of Studebaker Road/Loynes Drive. With implementation of the proposed project, intersection improvements would be provided to accommodate the projected turn movements and traffic volumes. The proposed project provides driveway aisles of 24 feet or greater throughout the project site, which are designed to City standards. In addition, all project driveway widths and parking stall widths satisfy the City's minimum requirements. Therefore, any impacts to emergency access associated with the proposed project will be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-50-3

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-50-4

The commenter states his opposition to a project that adds to traffic on Studebaker Road. Project impacts to Studebaker can be mitigated to a less than significant level with the exception of the east and west bound ramps to the SR 22. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-50-5

Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-50-6

This comment states that homes along Loynes Drive (south side of Vista) would be seriously impacted by noise and pollution from increases traffic a few feet from their residences. Please refer to Response to Comment P-18-3. As shown in Table 8 of the recirculated EIR, the largest project related increase in traffic noise along Loynes Drive would be 1.8 dBA under the Cumulative Weekend conditions. This increase in noise is less than the 3 dBA threshold of change that is perceptible to the average human ear in an outdoor environment. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant traffic noise impact along Loynes Drive.

The CO Hotspots analyses in Section 4.2 of the DEIR and Section 6.0 of the RDEIR show that at the two closest intersections to the portion of Loynes Drive the commenter is referring to will not experience CO concentrations near the AAQS. In general, vehicle emissions are much greater near

intersections than along roadways between intersections, because idling and acceleration activities are where the bulk of the vehicle emissions occur. Additionally, at intersections the vehicles are either not moving or moving relatively slowly, further concentrating the emissions. Due to these factors, CO concentrations at these homes along E. Vista Street would be less than the CO concentrations at the two nearest intersections.

While the traffic study did not specify the traffic mix of diesel and non-diesel vehicles on Loynes Drive, it is not expected that the proposed project traffic will change the mix because Loynes Drive is not a primary roadway designed for heavy-duty truck travel, nor is it a direct route to or from the proposed project site to the freeways/main arterials, thus, the vast majority of the project related traffic will be private vehicles of customers which are almost entirely non-diesel vehicles. Non-diesel engines have sufficient emission controls such that the emissions of hazardous pollutants are at a negligible level.

Therefore, since the CO Hotspots analysis shows that there will be no impact on these residences, and no other pollutants will be emitted in quantities of significance, there will be no impact on the air quality of these residents due to the implementation of this proposed project.

P-50-7

The comment states that added traffic in the project area would increase danger in the event of an emergency. The Disaster Management Division is located within the Support Services Bureau of the Fire Department, which is responsible for disaster planning, interagency coordination, planning and execution of citywide exercises, citywide Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) training, and management of the terrorism grant funds.

Responsibilities include staff and oversight of the Disaster Committee and the Terrorism Working Group. Representatives of this office coordinate closely with the Operational Area and the Governor's Office of Emergency Services to ensure that the coordination and compliance requirements of the SEMS regulations are maintained. Revisions in the City's Emergency Operations Plan are currently under way. These changes will bring the City into full compliance with SEMS regulations and planning guides.

The project site is bounded on the west by Studebaker Road. The proposed project will include improvements to these streets (as outlined in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 and in the Recirculated Draft EIR) to facilitate access to and from the proposed project site. There will be no changes to the street network that would adversely affect emergency response or evacuation plans and the proposed project site provides access for emergency vehicles (Police, Sheriff, Fire/Paramedics). Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-50-8

The comment states that the project would increase air pollution as a result of idling vehicles. Potential air quality impacts associated with the proposed project were evaluated in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. The analysis contained in DEIR 2005 included analysis of project impacts resulting from vehicular traffic including a CO hotspot analysis and a diesel toxics analysis. The proposed project

would not have a significant impact on local air quality for CO, and no mitigation measures would be required.

In addition, potential impacts from air toxics associated with diesel trucks would be less than significant. The proposed project would have significant unavoidable short-term construction air quality impacts (NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions) after the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. The proposed project would also have significant unavoidable long-term operational air quality impacts (CO, ROC, NO_x) due to the lack of feasible mitigation measures to reduce vehicular trip-related emissions. Similarly, the project would contribute to adverse cumulative air quality impacts because the Basin is presently in nonattainment for CO, PM₁₀, and O₃, and the project, in conjunction with other planned projects, would contribute to the existing nonattainment status.

P-50-9

This comment states that homes along Loynes Drive may be impacted by increased noise resulting from increased traffic on Loynes Drive. Please refer to Responses to Comments P-18-3, P-50-6, and P-50-9.

P-50-10

The comment states that some portions of Studebaker and Loynes flood during heavy rain. The emergency evacuation routes currently available to neighborhood residents will not be affected by the proposed project. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-50-11

The comment states that the proposed project site is close to the flight path for Long Beach Municipal Airport. As stated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005, the Long Beach Municipal Airport is located approximately three and one-half miles northwest of the project site. The proposed project site is not located within an aircraft flight path and is not located within the Airport Safety Zone or the Airport's current adopted noise contours. The Los Alamitos Reserve Air Station is located approximately two miles northeast of the site. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in a change in air traffic patterns that results in substantial safety risk. Likewise, the proposed project is not anticipated to be impacted by the existing airports. The impact of the proposed project on air traffic is anticipated to be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

P-50-12

The comment states that development of the project may increase risk of terrorist attacks on the electric generating stations. Refer to Common Response 4: Threat of Terrorist Attack.

P-50-13

The commenter opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

MARY ANNE GOLDEN (MAY 11, 2005)

P-51-1

The comment states that the project will result in unavoidable air and traffic impacts. Potential air quality impacts were addressed in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. Potential traffic impacts were addressed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005.

P-51-2

This comment states that the site is HAZMAT, needs to be cleaned up and that and that clean-up will put unavoidable poisons into the air. Remediation of the project site will be overseen by DTSC. Refer to Responses to Comments S-1-2, S-1-4, S-1-5, S-1-5, and S-1-11. Soil and air monitoring (Mitigation Measure 4.6.8) is a statutory requirement; the purpose of this requirement is prevent the release of hazardous concentrations of pollutants into the air.

P-51-3

The comment requests the number of deaths in Long Beach related to air quality annually. According to the California Air Resources Board (CARD), over 90 percent of Californians breathe unhealthy levels of one or more air pollutants during some part of the year. It is estimated that approximately 70,000 people indirectly die of respiratory and cardiovascular disease in the United States annually, many of which cases are linked to air quality and smog. CARB estimates that 9,000 Californians die annually from diseases caused or aggravated by air pollution, more than half of them in Southern California. Information on deaths in Long Beach related to air quality is not available at this time; however, DEIR 2005 and the Recirculated Draft EIR include an assessment of regional and localized short-term exposure to air pollutants that may, by definition, contribute to public health effects. This potentially significant impact, which relies on SCAQMD health-based thresholds, is correctly reported in DEIR 2005.

P-51-4

The comment requests that the number of new deaths on Loynes that will result from increased traffic. Refer to Response to Comment 1: Loynes Drive.

P-51-5

The comment expresses an opinion about the project and potential air pollution impacts. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-51-6

Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic

P-51-7

The comment disagrees with analysis presented in the EIR regarding police response times. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and analysis in the CEQA documents will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-51-8

The comment asks were day laborers that may be present on the Home Depot site will go to the bathroom. Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-10. The proposed Home Depot would include public restrooms.

P-51-9

The commenter was dissatisfied with the analysis in DEIR 2005 regarding noise and waste. Potential impact related to noise were evaluated in Section 4.9 of DEIR 2005. The analyses of potential impacts to the sanitary sewer system was revised and recirculated on June 2, 2006. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and analysis in the CEQA documents will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-51-10

The commenter disagrees that Studebaker Road will serve as a buffer between the Los Cerritos Wetlands and the proposed project site. As stated in DEIR 2005, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse effects to the Los Cerritos Wetlands from project sources such as traffic, light, and noise. These sources already exist and are not expected to increase substantially as a result of project implementation.

P-51-11

The comment summarizes letters received in response to Notice of Preparation (NOP). The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-51-12

The commenter supports development of a park or open space on the project site. The Home Depot site is not in public ownership, nor has it been identified by the City Department of Parks and Recreation as a possible park site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

The comment also states that the HAZMAT area should be cleaned. Refer to Response to Comment P-51-2.

MARY ANN GOLDEN (MAY 15, 2005)

P-52-1

The comment is introductory and references changes to the EIR. It is unclear from the comment what changes the commenter is referencing. Portions of DEIR 2005 were revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Changes to other sections are shown in the Errata found in the proposed Final EIR.

P-52-2

The comment requests a new EIR. Some of the analysis in DEIR 2005 was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Refer to Response to Comment P-52-1.

P-52-3

The comment summarizes letters received in response to the Notice of Preparation and potential impacts of the proposed project. The commenter opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-52-4

The commenter supports construction of a park or open space on the project site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-52-5

Please refer to Response to Comment P-51-12.

MARY ANN GOLDEN (JUNE 11, 2005)

P-53-1

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

The comment also states that the project will result in unavoidable air and traffic impacts. Potential air quality impacts were addressed in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. Potential traffic impacts were addressed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005.

P-53-2

The comment states that the reason owls do not nest on the site is because the site is poisonous. Refer to Response to Comment P-48-25 for information regarding potential hazardous conditions on the site. Refer to Section 4.3 of DEIR 2005 for information regarding the presence of owls on the site.

P-53-3

The comment requests the number of deaths of seniors and youths in Long Beach related to air quality annually. See Response to Comment P-51-3.

P-53-4

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive

P-53-5

The commenter opposes the proposed project and states that street signs are not an acceptable solution to potential cut through traffic. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-53-6

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive

P-53-7

The comment asks where day laborers that may be present on the Home Depot site will go to the bathroom. Please refer to Responses to Comments O-3-10 and P-51-8.

P-53-8

The comment summarizes letter received in response to the NOP. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-53-9

The commenter opposes the proposed project and supports development of a park or open space on the project site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

MARY ANN GOLDEN (JUNE 13, 2005)

P-54-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project and provided 108 letters against development of the project to the Planning Commission and Planning Department. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

MICHAEL GORDEN

P-55-1

The commenter supports selection of the No Development/No Build Alternative evaluated in DEIR 2005. The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

KATALIN GRANT

P-56-1

The comment suggests installation of speed bumps to slow traffic at the Margo Avenue entrance to University Park Estates. The City will require a Condition of Approval that will require installation of traffic calming measures if cut-through traffic is found to be a problem in the future.

P-56-2

The comment suggests installation of “Residents Only” or “No commercial vehicle” signs on 7th Street and Loynes. The comment also suggests signs directing patrons to Home Depot via PCH, Studebaker, and Loynes. Seventh Street is a designated truck route; Loynes Drive is not a truck route. It is illegal to restrict access to Residents Only on public streets. Prohibiting commercial vehicles on 7th Street is not possible since 7th Street is a truck route and commercial vehicles are expected to use this street. Refer to Response to Comment P-56-1.

P-56-3

The comment states that a bike path on Loynes would not be safe. The comment is noted. PDF-9, which included a bicycle lane on Loynes Drive, is no longer part of the project. Refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for more information.

CARMEN GROSS

P-57-1

The comment states that traffic conditions at Westminster and Studebaker/PCH and Loynes and Studebaker are unsatisfactory and additional traffic should not be added to the project area. Potential impacts related to traffic and circulation were analyzed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-57-2

The comment states that wildlife exists and would be impacted by the proposed project. Potential impacts to biological resources were evaluated in Section 4.3 of DEIR 2005. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3.1 will reduce potential impacts to jurisdictional waters to a less than significant level. All other potential project impacts are less than significant and do not require mitigation.

CATHERINE & MINNIE HADNOT

P-58-1

The comment states that BMSE should be used to investigate methane gas levels and questions the safety of placing a large commercial development next to an area with elevated methane levels. Refer to Response to Comment P-48-23.

P-58-2

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-58-3

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-58-4

The comment suggests locating the proposed Home Depot on Pacific Coast Highway near the In-N-Out Burger. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-58-5

The comment opposes approval of the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

KRISTAN HAITZ

P-59-1

The comment is a transmittal letter. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-59-2

The comment opposes the proposed project because of its potential traffic impacts. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. Potential traffic impacts were addressed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005.

P-59-3

Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-59-4

The commenter disagrees with the feasibility of a project design feature outlined in DEIR 2005. Specifically, the commenter does not accept the feasibility of traffic signal phasing and traffic signal coordination. Project design features were developed in consultation with Caltrans and City Traffic Engineers and have been deemed feasible by both agencies. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and project design features will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-59-5

The comment states that University Park estates has an existing sewage problem. The proposed project includes the replacement of 265 feet of existing 8-inch public sewer with 10-inch sewer in Vista Street between Daroca Street and Margo Street and the replacement of 261 feet of 8-inch sewer with a 10-inch diameter sewer between the manhole at Daroca and Vista Street and the first manhole in the Golf Course. From there, the wastewater would be conveyed to the Sanitation District's Marina Trunk Sewer, Section 3, located in Pacific Coast Highway north of Loynes Drive.

Replacement of the existing 8-inch sewers with 10-inch sewers will serve the proposed project and correct the hydraulic overloading conditions that currently exist during wet weather conditions. The existing Sanitation District 15-inch trunk sewer has a design capacity of 4.6 mgd and conveyed a peak flow of 1.2 mgd when last measured in 2003. Therefore, there is capacity for increased flows generated by the project.

Please note that the Project Description and Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005 were revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information regarding the proposed improvements to the public sewer system.

The Recirculated Draft EIR includes information regarding proposed improvements to the public sewer system, information regarding sewer generation rates, and capacity of sewer lines and sewer treatment plants. The information and analysis provided in the Recirculated Draft EIR are consistent

with CEQA requirements to provide a thorough and complete analysis of the environmental consequences of the proposed project.

P-59-6

The commenter expresses an opinion about the aesthetic value of the proposed project in comparison to the aesthetic value of the existing tank farm. Potential impacts related to aesthetics were evaluated in Section 4.1 of DEIR 2005. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and project design features will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-59-7

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and project design features will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

STEVEN ROBERT MCCORD

P-60-1

Please refer to Response to Comment P-78-2.

P-60-2

Please refer to Response to Comment P-78-3.

P-60-3

Please refer to Response to Comment P-78-4.

P-60-4

The commenter disagrees with the analysis in DEIR 2005 regarding impacts to the Los Cerritos Wetlands. As demonstrated in DEIR 2005, there is no evidence that such an impact would occur. Because the comment does not include data or information to substantiate the assertion that there is an impact, no further response is required. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-60-5

This comment states that projected tax revenue is overstated because there is another home improvement store less than four miles from the project site. As a general rule, an EIR is required to evaluate only the environment impacts of a project, and economic effects that are not related to physical impacts need not be evaluated in an EIR. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-60-6

The comment states that ground water, air quality, and soil contamination need to be carefully considered and not glossed over by a power point presentation. Potential impacts to groundwater were evaluated in Section 4.7 of DEIR 2005. Potential impacts related to air quality were analyzed in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. Potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials (including those in soil) were evaluated in Section 4.6 of DEIR 2005. In addition, the hazards analysis was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information and analysis of project impacts.

P-60-7

The comment states that DEIR 2005 is flawed and opposes approval of the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA analysis will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

JUDITH HESS

P-61-1

The comment is an email transmittal for the comment letter. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-61-2

The comment opposes approval of the proposed project because of the potential traffic impacts. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. Potential traffic impacts were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005.

P-61-3

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-61-4

The commenter believes Studebaker to be a congested road and opposes adding additional vehicular trips along this route. Potential impacts to Studebaker Road were analyzed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005.

The project applicant agreed to construct improvements that will enhance traffic flow and safety within the study area, including synchronized traffic lights. In addition to improvements the applicant has agreed to construct, the City of Long Beach will require implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.11.1 through 4.11.3. As stated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 and in the cumulative analysis presented in the Recirculated Draft EIR, even with implementation of these mitigation measures, the proposed project will result in significant impacts to the following intersections:

Weekday Peak Hour

- Studebaker Road/SR-22 westbound ramps
- Studebaker Road/SR-22 eastbound ramps (with Seaport Marina included)

Weekend Midday Peak Hour

- PCH/7th Street
- PCH/2nd Street

Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information regarding the cumulative analysis for the proposed Home Depot and Seaport Marina projects.

P-61-5

The commenter suggests selling the property to a cemetery development company. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

BETTER OBER

P-62-1

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project because of potential traffic impacts. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

CHARLES HIGGINS

P-63-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project because of its potential impacts on wetlands areas. Potential impacts to wetlands areas were evaluated in Section 4.3 of DEIR 2005. The entire area to be affected by project construction was surveyed. The area surveyed includes approximately 17.8 acres east of Studebaker Road and a small portion of the Los Cerritos Channel immediately north of the Loynes Street Bridge. A routine jurisdictional delineation was conducted on a small portion of the Los Cerritos Channel immediately north of the Loynes Street Bridge on July 2, 2004. As stated on page 4.3-9, no potential jurisdictional wetlands were identified at the project site or within the portion of the Los Cerritos Channel near the proposed sewer line construction. Therefore, potential impacts to jurisdictional wetlands as a result of the proposed project are less than significant, and no mitigation is required. In addition, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse effects to the Los Cerritos Wetlands. DEIR 2005 does include mitigation to prevent any incidental discharge of fill, debris, or other material into the Los Cerritos Channel and the two adjacent water supply channels.

P-63-2

The comment states that the project will result in additional vehicular traffic (car and truck), air pollution, road maintenance costs, and public safety concerns. Potential impacts related to traffic and circulation were addressed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Potential Air quality impacts were addressed in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. Potential impacts to police services were addressed in Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005. In addition, the public services and utilities analysis was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-63-3

The comment mischaracterizes the project site as an oil reserve site and a former City dump. The project site is neither an oil reserve site nor a former City dump. The site was a vacant wetlands area until it was developed with the tank farm in the 1950's. Refer to DEIR 2005 and the Recirculated EIR for further information. The former landfills are located west of Studebaker Road. Refer to Response to Comment O-7-9.

P-63-4

The comment questions the need for the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

BERNICE HOGAN

P-64-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project because of potential impacts related to traffic, air quality, and sewer system capacity. Potential impacts to traffic were addressed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Potential air quality impacts were addressed in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. Potential impacts related to sanitary sewers were addressed in Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005. In addition, the public services and utilities analysis was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information. Please also refer to Response to Comment P-59-5 for additional information regarding the proposed sewer system improvements.

DOUGLAS JORDAN

P-65-1

The comment is an email transmittal. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-65-2

The comment is introductory and the commenter opposes approval of the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-65-3

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-65-4

The comment erroneously states that the traffic study for the proposed project was begun after the conclusion of the instructional year at the California State University, Long Beach. As stated on page 4.11-4 of DEIR 2005, the City provided weekday peak-period intersection turn volumes for four study area intersections. Southland Car Counters collected the remaining weekday peak-hour intersection turn volumes in January 2004 and collected weekend peak-hour (midday) traffic counts in July 2004. For additional information refer to Appendix J of DEIR 2005 or the Recirculated Draft EIR.

P-65-5

The comment states that the existing sanitary sewer system is inadequate and cannot serve the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comment P-59-5.

P-65-6

The comment erroneously states that impacts to biological resources have not been adequately evaluated. Potential impacts to biological resources were evaluated in section 4.3 of DEIR 2005. The analysis in that section was based on a reconnaissance survey, focused surveys for the burrowing owl, and a jurisdictional delineation of waters of the U.S. In addition, a records search was conducted to assist in determining the existence or potential occurrence of any sensitive plant and animal species or sensitive natural communities on site or in the project vicinity. Database records for the *Los Alamitos* USGS 7.5 minute series quadrangle were examined using the (CDFG) RareFind 3, Version 3.0.3, and the California Native Plant Society's (CNPS) Electronic Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California (6th ed., electronic version 1.5.2). Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3.1 will reduce potential impacts to jurisdictional waters to a less than significant level. All other potential project impacts are less than significant and do not require mitigation.

P-65-7

The comment erroneously states that the Planning Commission has reviewed alternative proposal for the proposed project site and the commenter supports development of a storage facility. The alternatives discussed at the Planning Commission Hearing are those analyzed in DEIR 2005 as required by CEQA. No alternative proposals have been submitted for the City of Long Beach for the proposed project site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-65-8

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

RODNEY AND PARASKEVI JUNE

P-66-1

The commenters oppose approval of the proposed project due to potential impacts related to traffic (at Studebaker and the westbound SR-22 ramps), air quality, and noise. Potential impacts to traffic and circulation were addressed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Potential impacts related to air quality were addressed in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. Potential impacts related to noise were addressed in Section 4.9 of DEIR 2005. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

MELVIN KANTZ

P-67-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project and disagrees with the analysis of project impacts presented in DEIR 2005. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA analysis will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-67-2

The comment erroneously states that the traffic study for the proposed project was not completed prior to release of DEIR 2005 for public review. The Traffic Study for the proposed project was completed in January 2005. For additional information refer to Appendix J of DEIR 2005 and the Recirculated Draft EIR.

GAY KEATING

P-68-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project because of potential traffic impacts and public safety concerns. Potential impacts related to traffic and circulation were addressed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Potential impacts related to the provision of police services were addressed in Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005. In addition, the public services and utilities section was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

JEANETTE KLEMPNER

P-69-1

The comment states that the project should not be constructed because of the soft soil on the project site. The site lies within the southwestern block of the Los Angeles Basin, which is comprised of a low alluvial floodplain. Undocumented fill soils were encountered within the upper 7 to 10 feet of existing site grades, relative to the base of the existing soil berms. These materials consist of very moist to moist mixtures of clay and silty sand. The existing ASTs are supported on 10 inches of crushed aggregate/rock overlying 5 feet of compacted fill soils, which extend 10 feet beyond the tanks. Site preparation includes removal of existing facilities, excavation, subgrade preparation, placement and compaction of fill, foundation preparation, floor slab preparation, positive surface gradient preparation, and pavement of other areas. Specific procedures consistent with soil preparation and foundation design will be adhered to during this phase. Structures, vegetation, debris, pavement, footings, utilities, and tree roots will need to be removed. Excavations will include removal of undocumented fill soils and upper compressible soils, footing excavations, and trenching for utility lines and the petroleum pipelines that will remain. The subgrade will require stabilization to facilitate fill placement and support earthmoving equipment. Fill material type, placement, and compaction will be inspected by the on-site geotechnical engineer, who will also perform soil tests as necessary. Section 4.5 of DEIR 2005 suggests specific mitigation measures that will mitigate potential project impacts related to Geology and Soils. All potential geologic, seismic, and soil-related impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant level.

P-69-2

The comment states that there is an animal corridor in the area of construction that would be destroyed by project implementation. It is unlikely that the project site is part of a local or regional animal corridor because the existing tank farm is fenced on three sides.

P-69-3

The comment suggests an alternate location for the proposed project. As stated in Chapter 6.0 of DEIR 2005, the City of Long Beach is nearly built out, with little vacant land available for development. The General Plan and aerial photographs were used in order to identify potential alternative sites for the proposed project within the City limits. The City of Long Beach "Disposition of Vacant Land" map (Summer 2001) was also reviewed. This map identifies 11 sites with development potential. The Los Cerritos Wetlands site is the only location in the market area identified by Home Depot other than the proposed project site. Given the limitations imposed by the Coastal Act and the constraints associated with development of coastal wetlands, the use of the Los Cerritos Wetlands as an alternative site for the proposed project is considered infeasible.

WILLIAM AND LOUISE LAKOFF AND NEIGHBORS

P-70-1

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-70-2

The comment expresses concern regarding potential impacts related to traffic and the surrounding circulation system. Potential impacts related to traffic and circulation were analyzed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 and potential cumulative traffic, air quality, and noise impacts related to the proposed Home Depot and Seaport Marina projects were analyzed in the Recirculated Draft EIR. As stated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 and the Recirculated Draft EIR, even with implementation of these mitigation measures, the proposed project will result in significant impacts to the following intersections:

Weekday Peak Hour

- Studebaker Road/SR-22 westbound ramps
- Studebaker Road/SR-22 eastbound ramps (with Seaport Marina added)

Weekend Midday Peak Hour

- PCH/7th Street
- PCH/2nd Street

Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information related to the cumulative traffic analysis.

P-70-3

The comment states that the proposed project would impact surrounding neighborhoods. Potential impacts to the surrounding neighborhoods are addressed throughout Section 4.0 in DEIR 2005 and in the Recirculated Draft EIR.

P-70-4

The commenter and comment letter signatories oppose approval of the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

TOM AND JENNIFER LEBRUN

P-71-1

The commenter believes DEIR 2005 to be deficient and/or incomplete. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA analysis will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-71-2

The comment states that the EIR's scope is too limited because it did not evaluate development of all vacant land in the vicinity of the proposed project site. As stated in Chapter 2.0, DEIR 2005 is a project-level EIR prepared consistent with Section 15161 of the State CEQA Guidelines. A Project EIR focuses primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from transition of the project site in its current condition to development and operation of the proposed project. DEIR 2005 examined all phases of the proposed project including site preparation, construction, and ongoing operation of the project.

An EIR must also discuss a cumulative impact if the project's incremental effect combined with the effects of another project is "cumulatively considerable." Cumulative impacts are based on the build out of the project and the surrounding area, including all other known or reasonably foreseeable proposed projects in the surrounding area. As stated in DEIR 2005, two cumulative projects were identified in the cumulative condition based on discussions with the City of Long Beach and City of Seal Beach Planning Departments: (1) 120 Studebaker Road, and (2) the Boeing Specific Plan. The proposed Seaport Marina project was also added to the cumulative analysis in the Recirculated Draft EIR. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR and Common Response 2: Seaport Marina for additional information.

Section 15126 (d) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR also analyze growth-inducing impacts and states that an EIR should discuss the ways in which the project could foster economic or population growth or construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Impacts associated with the removal of obstacles to growth as well as the development of facilities that encourage and facilitate growth are considered to be growth inducing. However, the CEQA Guidelines also state that it should not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

As stated in DEIR 2005, the potential for the project to generate additional growth in the City is unlikely because the proposed development is intended to primarily serve existing residents of the City. The employment potential of the project is not of a magnitude that would cause significant numbers of people to relocate to the area solely for the purpose of being close to the site. Based on these considerations, the proposed project would not induce population growth in the community or result in economic growth that exceeds levels anticipated in plans adopted by the City of Long Beach. Therefore, the scope of DEIR 2005 was appropriate.

P-71-3

The comment states that it is unclear what projects, other than the Boeing Specific Plan, were considered in the cumulative analysis. Unless otherwise stated in each topic section in Chapter 4.0, the cumulative study area included both the project at 120 Studebaker and the Boeing Specific Plan in

the City of Seal Beach. Table 4.8.C in DEIR 2005 provides a description of planned future projects and Figure 4.8.4 provides the location of each. The proposed Seaport Marina project was also added to the cumulative analysis in the Recirculated Draft EIR. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR and Common Response 2: Seaport Marina, for additional information.

P-71-4

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-71-5

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-71-6

Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-71-7

Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-71-8

The comment states that the project site is unsuited to commercial development. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-71-9

The comment states that a Draft Sewer Capacity Study was used in preparation of DEIR 2005 and questions information provided by the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles regarding estimated average wastewater flow. Please refer to responses to comment L-1-2 through L-1-6 and P-59-5. The sewage flow estimate provided by the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles was based on the project as proposed in the NOP which was approximately 34,000 square feet larger than the project evaluated in DEIR 2005.

P-71-10

The comment states that potential impacts to the neighborhood during construction of the sewer line were not analyzed. Analysis of potential sewer line impacts is included in the Recirculated Draft EIR. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-71-11

The comment suggests several additional options for bringing sewer service to the proposed project site. The project proponent examined three alternate solutions for conveying and disposing of

approximately 10,000 gallons per day of sanitary wastewater: 1) on-site storage and trucking the waste to the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts (LACSD), 2) on-site treatment and discharge to the San Gabriel River, and 3) conveying the sanitary wastewater to a local sewer collection system. The first two were eliminated due to the lack of reliability, potential impact on the environment, and cost. The project proponent considered six options for conveying the sewage via a lift station from the site followed by gravity flow to a local sewer in Long Beach, as well as one option to convey the sewage across the San Gabriel River to an Orange County Sanitation District sewer in Seal Beach.

The preferred alternative and recommended option was reviewed and approved by the City of Long Beach Water Department is the shortest distance to an existing sanitary sewer constructed over the least amount of bad soil conditions (such as exist along Studebaker Road or Loynes Drive). The option is to install a force main from the site across the Loynes Drive Bridge, connect to the existing gravity sewer at Vista Avenue and Loynes Drive, and enlarge the two lengths of residential sewers to provide capacity for the project and additional residential sewer capacity needed during storm events. This option was preferred by the Project Applicant when compared to other options because, while it will impact the local residents during construction, it will have less impact on businesses and traffic during construction and when maintenance is required.

P-71-12

The comment states that the proposed hours of operation are too long. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-71-13

The comment is concerned about the aesthetics of the proposed Home Depot store. Potential aesthetic impacts of the proposed project were analyzed in Section 4.1 of DEIR 2005. With implementation of mitigation measures, all project impacts related to visual resources are less than significant. In addition, the City will review the final proposed elevations during site plan review to ensure project plans reflect conditions of approval and required mitigation.

P-71-14

This comment states that the developer should purchase and improve the 1.1-acre site at the intersection of 7th Street and Silvera Avenue and to deed it to the City or the Long Beach Unified School District to ensure that it remains under public control as open space. The addition of these parcels to the proposed project is evaluated in Chapter 3.0 of the Recirculated EIR. It is the intention of the project applicant to deed this open space area to the City of Long Beach for inclusion in its inventory of open space areas after its conversion to landscaped open space.

P-71-15

This comment states that projected tax revenue is overstated. As a general rule, an EIR is required to evaluate only the environment impacts of a project, and economic effects that are not related to

physical impacts need not be evaluated in an EIR. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-71-16

The comment states that the project is not appropriate for the area and reiterates the commenter's opinion about expanding the scope of the CEQA document. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA analysis will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

JOYCE LINGLE

P-72-1

The commenter supports approval of the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

ART LOCKHART

P-73-1

The comment states that the proposed Home Depot is too large for the project site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-73-2

The comment states that the store would require expanded police and fire services. Potential impacts to police and fire services were evaluated in Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005. The project will not require new or physically altered police or fire protection facilities or 10 or more additional personnel to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or performance objectives. In addition, the Public Services was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-73-3

The comment state that the project may attract day laborers. Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-10.

P-73-4

The comment questions whether the hours of operation and “lumber car corrals” will attract contractors. Home Depot Design Centers are design and service stores that take projects from concept to completion. The traditional customer at a design center is a homeowner doing home remodeling or repair or a “buy-it-yourself” customer who will hire a contractor to install the materials purchased. Although Home Depot Design Centers carry products that are purchased by contractors, they are not the primary market for this type of store. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein; and, no further response is necessary.

P-73-5

The comment questions where the project site boundaries are located. Comprising 16.7 acres, the proposed project site is located at 400 Studebaker Road at the intersection of Studebaker and Loynes Drive. Two water supply channels from Los Cerritos Channel surround the project site to the north and south. Studebaker Road forms the western boundary of the proposed project site, and facilities associated with the AES electric generating plants are located adjacent to the eastern boundary. A map showing the vicinity of the project area and site location is shown in Figure 3.1 in DEIR 2005.

P-73-6

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project and states that other alternatives, such as professional offices, have few problems for the community. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

KERRY MARTIN

P-74-1

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project because of potential traffic, air quality, and sewer concerns. Potential impacts to traffic and circulation were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Potential impacts related to air quality were evaluated in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. Potential impacts related to the extension of sewer lines were evaluated in Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005. In addition, the public services and utilities analysis was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-74-2

The comment states concerns regarding potential negative impacts to the Los Cerritos Wetlands. Potential impacts to the Los Cerritos Wetlands were evaluated in Section 4.3 of DEIR 2005. As stated in Section 4.3 of DEIR 2005, the project site is separated from the Los Cerritos wetlands by a major arterial (Studebaker Road). Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse effects to the Los Cerritos Wetlands from project sources such as traffic, light, and noise. These sources already exist and are not expected to increase substantially. DEIR 2005 does include mitigation to prevent any incidental discharge of fill, debris, or other material into the Los Cerritos Channel and the two adjacent water supply channels.

P-74-3

The comment suggests that a professional office complex would be a better use of the project site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

ROBERT MASON

P-75-1

The comment opposes the proposed project because of potential traffic impacts. Potential traffic impacts were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-75-2

The comment states that there is no need for the proposed project or any other commercial development near the Edison Plant. The power plants located near the project site are currently operated by AES Alamitos, LLC. The LADWP Haynes Generating Station is located to the southeast of the project site across the San Gabriel River. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-75-3

The comment states that potential cumulative traffic impacts of the proposed project are unacceptable. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. Refer to Common Response 2: Seaport Marina.

P-75-4

The comment states that land adjacent to the project site is subject to subsidence. Subsidence is the settlement of in-place subgrade soils caused by loads generated by large earthmoving equipment. The Geotechnical Analysis presented in DEIR 2005 was limited to the proposed project site. The project site is not located within an area of known subsidence that may be associated with groundwater or petroleum withdrawal, peat oxidation, or hydrocompaction. No oil exploration has been reported at the site specifically, although the site is located within the limits of the greater Seal Beach Oil Field (Mission 2004). Known ground subsidence associated with oil withdrawal was recorded in the Wilmington area, approximately 8 miles west of the site. Any historic land subsidence in the site area has been since minimized as a result of freshwater injection through the operations of the Los Alamitos Barrier Project, which is located near the site. Thus, the potential site constraint associated with land subsidence is considered low, and no mitigation is required.

P-75-5

The comment states that oil is still being produced in the project area with out salt water injection. No oil exploration has been reported at the site specifically, although the site is located within the limits of the greater Seal Beach Oil Field (Mission 2004).

P-75-6

The comment asks who will pay for soil remediation and cleanup. The property owner is responsible for site remediation. The project applicant is responsible for implementation of the mitigation measures that are applicable to site development.

P-75-7

The comment states that the residents of College Park in the City of Seal Beach have a voice in issues like the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-75-8

The comment states that there is no need for the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-75-9

The comment states that the proposed project will increase traffic and degrade lifestyles in the project area. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-75-10

The comment states that the proposed project may force several small businesses in Seal Beach to close. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not include data or information regarding the connection between businesses in Seal Beach and the proposed project and how these businesses might be affected. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about the environment, about DEIR 2005, or about the analysis therein, and no further response is necessary.

ALFRED MATZ

P-76-1

The comment states that Loyne Drive has a history of subsidence problems that create a “roller coaster effect.” Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

LOLA MAYDA

P-77-1

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project because of potential traffic impacts and supports an alternative that will not generate as many vehicular trips. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

ANGELA BAILEY MCCORD

P-78-1

The comment expresses concern over possible increases in traffic on Loynes Drive and states that the road is susceptible to flooding and may pose a potential hazard to unfamiliar drivers. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. Please refer to Response to Comment P-78-2 and Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-78-2

The comment poses several questions about project impacts related to Loyne Drive. The project trip distribution was presented on page 4.11-9 of DEIR 2005. Approximately 10 percent of the projects trips are destined northwest via PCH; 15 percent north via Bellflower Boulevard; 20 percent north via Studebaker Road; 5 percent south via PCH; 20 percent east via SR-22 and 2nd Street; and 30 percent west via 2nd Street, Loynes Drive, and 7th Street. The net trip generation for the proposed Home Depot Center is approximately 5,783 average daily trips (ADT), 239 a.m. peak-hour trips, and 422 p.m. peak-hour trips. Therefore, approximately 1,807 daily trips will travel west via 2nd Street, Loynes Drive, and 7th Street. Please refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-78-3

The comment states that DEIR 2005 does not contain adequate mitigation for impacts to freeway off-ramps and intersections. As stated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005, improvements to Studebaker Road/SR-22 westbound and eastbound ramps would require potential encroachment into the Los Cerritos Channel immediately adjacent and parallel to Studebaker Road. In addition, Caltrans has no plans to improve these facilities. As such, there are no feasible improvements at this location that would mitigate the project's impact. The Draft EIR and the Recirculated EIR also stated that significant unavoidable impacts would occur at the intersections of PCH and 7th Street and PCH and 2nd Street. Due to right-of-way constraints at these intersections, there are no feasible improvements that would mitigate the project's impact. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and project mitigation will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

The comment questions the need for a family restaurant on the site and suggests that unobstructed travel routes are more important. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-78-4

This comment states that projected tax revenue is overstated. As a general rule, an EIR is required to evaluate only the environment impacts of a project, and economic effects that are not related to physical impacts need not be evaluated in an EIR. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-78-5

This comment states that projected tax revenue is overstated. As a general rule, an EIR is required to evaluate only the environment impacts of a project, and economic effects that are not related to

physical impacts need not be evaluated in an EIR. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-78-6

The comment states that the City of Long Beach has an opportunity to assume a leadership role in the preservation of the Los Cerritos Wetlands and endangered species. As stated in section 4.3 of DEIR 2005, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse effects to the Los Cerritos Wetlands from project sources such as traffic, light, and noise. These sources already exist and are not expected to increase substantially. In addition, no endangered species were observed on the project site during surveys. Opinions expressed by the commenter will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-78-7

The comment states that disturbance of the “toxic waste dump” near Loynes Drive needs to be carefully considered. This former landfill is not on the project site and will not be disturbed as part of the project. Refer to Response to Comment O-7-9.

P-78-8

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project because of the potential traffic impacts. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

ANGELA BAILEY MCCORD

P-79A-1

The comment is an email transmittal. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-79A-2

The comment contains several questions about Loynes Drive. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-79A-3

The comment asks whether “primary cause of collision” is a required field on an accident report. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-79A-4

The comment asks if officer’s list any causes other than “unsafe speed” for collisions in which only one accident is involved. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-79A-5

The comment asks if it unusual for an 0.82 mile segment of roadway to experience the number of accidents that occur on Loynes. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-79A-6

The comment asks if the City Engineer’s analysis included the accident that occurred in June 2005 on Loynes Drive. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-79A-7

The comment states that the usual accident activity does not occur at the intersection of Loynes and Studebaker, but on Loynes Drive. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-79A-8

The comment states that the unsafe characteristics of Loynes Drive are demonstrated by the number of single car “hit object” collisions. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-79A-9

The comment states that the proposed project would increase traffic on Loynes Drive during daytime and nighttime hours. The traffic analysis presented in DEIR 2005 and the Recirculated Draft EIR stated that approximately 30 percent of project travel will travel west via 2nd Street, Loynes Drive, and 7th Street.

ANGELA BAILEY MCCORD

P-79B-1

Please refer to Response to Comment P-79A-1.

P-79B-2

Please refer to Response to Comment P-79A-2.

P-79B-3

Please refer to Response to Comment P-79A-3.

P-79B-4

Please refer to Response to Comment P-79A-4.

P-79B-5

Please refer to Response to Comment P-79A-5.

P-79B-6

Please refer to Response to Comment P-79A-6.

P-79B-7

Please refer to Response to Comment P-79A-7.

P-79B-8

Please refer to Response to Comment P-79A-8.

P-79B-9

Please refer to Response to Comment P-79A-9.

UNKNOWN

P-80-1

The comment states the function and importance of the Los Cerritos Wetlands. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

ROSEMARY MCCLURE

P-81-1

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project because of potential traffic impacts. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

RHEA MEALEY

P-82-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project because of potential traffic, noise, air pollution, and safety concerns. The commenter also opposes a project at the intersection of PCH and 2nd Street. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

OLGA AND PHIL MEGDAL

P-83-1

The commenters oppose the proposed project because, in their opinion, it will destroy the intimate ambiance of their community. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-83-2

The commenters object to the potential traffic impacts that may result from project implementation. Potential project impacts were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Please refer to Response to Comment P-11-1.

P-83-3

The comment questions the need for the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-83-4

The comment states that the proposed project may attract day laborers which may lead to an increase in crime in the neighborhood. Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-10.

P-83-5

The comment states that the proposed project may force several small businesses in Belmont Shores and Seal Beach to close. No evidence is provided to substantiate the claim that the proposed project would affect existing businesses. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. As a general rule, an EIR is required to evaluate only the environmental effects of a project and environmental effects that are not related to physical impacts need not be evaluated in an EIR. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-83-6

The commenters oppose the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

WILLIAM DONALD MILLIS

P-84-1

The comment is a transmittal letter. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-84-2

The comment states that DEIR 2005 is flawed because it states that the proposed project does not represent substantial growth to the City of Long Beach, instead of acknowledging that the proposed project represents substantial growth to the localized project area (e.g. University Park Estates). The statement in question pertains to potential impacts related to Housing and Population. The City of Long Beach is the correct study area for measuring potential impacts related to population growth and housing needs because these factors are evaluated on a city-wide and regional basis. Furthermore, even within the context of the immediate surrounding area, the proposed project will not generate enough new jobs to induce population growth. Therefore, DEIR 2005 is correct in stating that the businesses proposed do not represent substantial new growth in the context of the entire City of Long Beach business and employment base and are not anticipated to create indirect growth in the City of Long Beach due to the relatively small expansion of the employment base.

P-84-3

The comment states that the proposed project will increase use of Loynes and lead to increases in noise and air pollution for homes that are located adjacent to the roadway. Please refer to Response to Comments P-18-3 and Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-84-4

The comment states that there are no provisions for enforcing the “No loitering” signs required by the on-site Security Plan. The Security Plan also calls for bonded security guards who may ask loiterers to leave the premises. In addition, the City of Long Beach Police Department has the authority to enforce “No Loitering” signs pursuant to Municipal Code Section.

P-84-5

The commenter disagrees with the analysis of cut-through traffic presented in DEIR 2005. Please refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-84-6

The comment states that it is not feasible to mitigate impacts to the intersection of Studebaker Road and the SR-22 ramps. This is consistent with the discussion of project impacts and potential mitigation presented in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005.

P-84-7

The comment erroneously states that the EIR concluded that mitigation of project impacts to the intersection of Studebaker and 2nd Street is not feasible. DEIR 2005 stated that the weekday peak-

hour and weekend peak hour impact at Studebaker Road/2nd Street would be reduced to a less than significant level by providing a shared through-right-turn lane on westbound 2nd Street. This was identified as an impacted intersection in the Boeing Specific Plan Traffic Impact Analysis. This report recommended a fair-share contribution of approximately 85 percent for this improvement. Because there is no formal commitment to construct the recommended improvement, this impact would not be considered mitigated to a less than significant level unless the Home Depot project applicant actually makes the improvement and requests reimbursement from the Boeing Specific Plan developer. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.11.3 of the Recirculated Draft EIR would reduce the weekday and weekend impact at Studebaker Road/2nd Street to a less than significant level.

P-84-8

The commenter disagrees with the effectiveness of mitigation suggested for the intersection of Loynes Drive and Studebaker Road. The evaluation of project impacts includes traffic generated by the proposed project in addition to existing and cumulative future project traffic. Based on the traffic model for the proposed project, DEIR 2005 concluded that Mitigation Measure 4.11.3 of the Recirculated Draft EIR would reduce the weekday and weekend impacts at Studebaker Road/Loynes Drive to a less than significant level. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA analysis will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-84-9

The comment states the DEIR 2005 did not discuss the impact of the proposed Seaport Marina project, the effect of traffic congestion on Kettering Elementary and the resident of University Park Estates, and the effect of lowering home values in University Park Estates. Refer to Common Response 2: Seaport Marina. The traffic and circulation impacts of the proposed project were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information. Please also refer to responses to comment O-6-6 and O-6-21.

P-84-10

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project because of its potential impacts on people. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

BOB MOROZ

P-85-1

The comment is introductory and does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein. Therefore, no further response is necessary.

P-85-2

The comment states that project traffic will make it more difficult for people to enter or leave the southeast corner of Long Beach. Please refer to Response to Comment P-11-1.

P-85-3

The comment states that Loynes Drive is potentially unsafe. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-85-4

The comment states that DEIR 2005 did not indicate if any studies were done regarding potential hazardous materials on the project site and that “toxins” could be “let loose” during tank removal and construction. The comment also asks how much liability will be borne by the City of Long Beach if the Fire Department is the lead regulatory agency for monitoring of cleanup. The list of prior investigative reports reviewed is provided in the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for the project (Appendix F of DEIR 2005). As discussed in DEIR 2005 and the Recirculated EIR, shallow soils have been impacted by petroleum hydrocarbons and arsenic, methane was found in subsurface soils, and asbestos, lead-based paint and PCBs are presumed to be present in existing structures. Refer to Response to Comment S-1-2 regarding oversight and to P-75-6 regarding financial responsibility for site remediation.

P-85-5

The comment urges the City to do further study and suggests that the project may end up costing the City money. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

CHARLEEN MULLEN

P-86-1

The comment states that Loynes does not appear to be stable and traffic congestion on Studebaker would increase to unacceptable levels if the proposed project is implemented. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive and Response to Comment P-15-3.

P-86-2

The comment states that the project will contribute to air quality impacts in the neighborhood and cause cut-through traffic. Potential air quality impacts were evaluated in Section 4.2 of the DEIR 2005. As stated in DEIR 2005, the proposed project would have significant unavoidable short-term construction air quality impacts (NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions) after the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. The proposed project would also have significant unavoidable long-term operational air quality impacts (CO, ROC, NO_x) due to the lack of feasible mitigation measures to reduce vehicular trip-related emissions. Similarly, the project would contribute to adverse cumulative air quality impacts because the Basin is presently in nonattainment for CO, PM₁₀, and O₃, and the project, in conjunction with other planned projects, would contribute to the existing nonattainment status. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-86-3

The comment states that existing sewers may not adequately serve the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comment P-59-5.

P-86-4

The comment suggests developing a public storage facility on the project site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

VICTOR MURILLO, ROSA CARILLO, ALAN JACKSON, LILA CLAY

P-87-1

The commenter opposes any type of retail development on the project site because of potential impacts related to the Pacific Flyway and traffic. The comment supports using the site as wildlife habitat or an interactive learning center for inner city children. The project site currently serves a relatively minor function as a stopover in the “Pacific Flyway” used by birds during migration. The plant species on the site are not different from species commonly found in the Long Beach area environment in local parks, backyards, and parkways. Please note that nesting birds are protected during nesting by State law and/or by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Please refer to Response to Comment S-2-2.

Potential traffic impacts were analyzed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Please refer to DEIR 2005 for additional information.

Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

KEITH NOTTAGE

P-88-1

The comment states that DEIR 2005 has “conveniently omitted flaws or false impressions of conditions that are contract to fact.” Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA analysis will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-88-2

The commenter is concerned about project traffic using Loynes Drive to access the project site given the unique physical characteristics of the road. The comment also questions the financial burden to the City in terms of maintaining the roadway when used by project traffic. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-88-3

The comment states the hours of operation would attract contractors and day laborers. The proposed project includes a Home Depot Design and Garden Center. Home Depot Design Centers are design and service stores that take projects from concept to completion. Home Depot Design Centers offer homeowners professional design and installation services and carry well regarded home improvement and design products. The traditional customer at a design center is a homeowner doing home remodeling or repair or a “buy-it-yourself” customer who will hire a contractor to install the materials purchased. Although Home Depot Design Centers carry products that are purchased by contractors, they are not the primary market for this type of store. The proposed project is not a Home Depot EXPO store. Please refer to responses to comment O-3-10 regarding day laborers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein; and, no further response is necessary.

P-88-4

The comment erroneously states that traffic studies were conducted on Studebaker between the hours of 1:30 and 3:00 pm on weekdays. As stated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005, traffic counts were conducted for 24-hour periods by Southland Car Counters in January 2004 (weekday) and July 2004 (weekend). The analysis presented in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 was based on the Traffic Impact Analysis completed in January 2005.

P-88-5

The comment states that Studebaker Road is “sinking.” Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 evaluated potential project impacts related to traffic. As stated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005, the proposed project would result in a significant unavoidable weekday impact at the westbound onramps to State Route 22 from Studebaker Road. Other potential project impacts to Studebaker Road can be mitigated to a less than significant level. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-88-6

This comment states that the proposed Seaport Marina project was omitted from the cumulative analysis. Refer to Common Response 2: Seaport Marina.

P-88-7

The comment states that existing sewers will be overloaded by the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comment P-59-5.

P-88-8

The commenter states that he does not understand how surface runoff from the proposed project will be handled. As stated in Section 4.7 of DEIR 2005, the project will be required to implement several Source Control and Treatment Control BMPs in order to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practical. Treatment Control BMPs will be incorporated into the design of the on-site storm drain system to treat project runoff in accordance with the SUSMP standards. Source Control BMPs that are applicable to the project are provided in Table 4.7.F. Table 4.7.G shows Treatment Control BMPs included as part of the project as well as those that will be considered during final design. Table 4.7.H shows the effectiveness of standard Treatment Control BMPs to remove pollutants of concern.

P-88-9

The comment states that the DEIR overlooked the Los Cerritos Wetlands. Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-11.

P-88-10

The comment states that the proposed project warrants additional review by the California Coastal Commission. The project site and much of the surrounding area is subject to the Local Coastal Program (LCP), a City of Long Beach and California Coastal Commission (CCC) approved land development and land use plan. As stated in DEIR 2005 on page 5.8-7, a Local Coastal Development Permit (LCDP) is required by California State law to permit construction of certain uses in a designated Coastal Zone. Any project in the Coastal Zone that requires discretionary approval will require a Local Coastal Permit. Since the project requires approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to establish retail land uses in Subarea 19 of the PD-1 zoning district, an LCDP must be approved by the City.

In some cases, decisions made by the City of Long Beach City Council (City Council) regarding approvals (or denials) of LCDPs may be appealed to the CCC. Appeals of local government Coastal Permit decisions are limited by a variety of factors and requirements of the Coastal Act. For a local government decision to be appealed to the CCC, the project site must: (1) be located within the appeals area, as shown on the Commission-adopted Post-LCP Certification Permit and Appeal Jurisdiction Map; (2) In coastal counties only, an approval decision on a development that is not designated as the principal permitted use under the certified zoning ordinance, or zoning district map; or (3) Any decision on a major works project or major energy facility is appealable.

The proposed project site is located within the Coastal Zone and a portion of the project site (west of Studebaker) is located in the appealable area. Therefore, decisions made by the City Council regarding the proposed project are appealable to the CCC.

P-88-11

The comment states that potential tax revenue from the proposed project has been overstated and the project may cost the City money. As a general rule, an EIR is required to evaluate only the environment impacts of a project, and economic effects that are not related to physical impacts need not be evaluated in an EIR. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

STACEY REDFERN CORDELL

P-89-1

The comment states that University Park Estates is already used as a cut-through route and traffic from the proposed project will increase cut-through traffic. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-89-2

The comment states that the proposed project may attract day laborers. Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-10

P-89-3

The comment states that children in the neighborhood will not be expecting cut-through traffic and could potentially be hit by a vehicle. The comment also suggests that Home Depot commit to making University Park Estates a private neighborhood. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

KARIN RICE

P-90-1

The commenter is concerned about the proposed project because of potential impacts related to air quality, hazardous waste, the Los Cerritos Channel, mitigation costs to the City, and traffic. Potential air quality impacts were evaluated in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. Potential impacts related to hazardous waste were evaluated in Section 4.6 of DEIR 2005. Potential impacts to the Los Cerritos Channel were evaluated in Section 4.3 of DEIR 2005. Potential impacts related to traffic were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. In addition, the hazards analysis was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information. The cost of project mitigation will be borne by the project applicant.

P-90-2

The comment states that the significant impacts caused by the proposed project will cause a hardship for thousands of Long Beach residents. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-90-3

The comment states that concerns related to cut-through traffic are well founded because the commenter has used the cut-through routes in the neighborhood. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

The comment also states that intersections in the City of Seal Beach should have been included in the traffic analysis. Refer to Response to Comment L-2-5.

P-90-4

The comment states that the project will potentially impact a large number of Long Beach residents. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

DEAN RICHARDSON

P-91-1

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-91-2

The commenter question the legality of developing the site given its proximity to a “toxic dump” site. Refer to Response to Comment O-7-9.

P-91-3

The commenter is concerned about potential traffic impacts. The potential traffic impacts of the proposed project were analyzed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Please refer to DEIR 2005 for additional information.

P-91-4

The comment describes the physical state of Loynes Drive and suggests that the road may increase the risk of traffic accidents. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-91-5

The comment states that 2nd Street is already overloaded with traffic and the proposed project would exacerbate the situation. Please refer to Response to Comment P-11-1.

P-91-6

The comment states that 7th Street between 2nd Street and I-405 is becoming problematic in terms of traffic congestion. Please refer to Response to Comment P-11-1.

P-91-7

The comment states that 7th Street between SR-22 and PCH is becoming problematic in terms of traffic congestion. Please refer to Response to Comment P-11-1.

P-91-8

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project and recommends approval of an unnamed alternative that will not pollute or add traffic. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

LISA RINALDI

P-92-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project because of the significant unavoidable impacts stated in DEIR 2005 and because of potential cut-through traffic impacts. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

The comment incorrectly states that the proposed project site is not zoned for the proposed project. The proposed project would require a Conditional Use Permit and standards variances but would otherwise be consistent with the current zoning designation, Planned Development (PD-1).

P-92-2

The comment states that preserving and creating open space is an acceptable alternative to the proposed project because it would be more aesthetically pleasing and would not ignore quality of life issues. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

CARMEN ROSAS

P-93-1

The commenter believes DEIR 2005 to be flawed and requested an extension to the DEIR response period until an adequate investigation has been completed. Pursuant to Section 15105 of the State CEQA Guidelines, DEIR 2005 was circulated for public review for a period of 45 days. The Recirculated Draft EIR will be circulated for an additional 45-day public review period.

P-93-2

The comment states that the project contributes to the perpetuation of air quality concerns in the South Coast Air Basin and that children are at risk for health impacts associated with poor air quality. Please refer to responses to comment O-3-8, O-9-6, and P-1-16.

ROBERT ROSAS

P-94-1

The comment consists of an introduction to the comment letter. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-1.

P-94-2

The comment erroneously states that five intersections were evaluated in the traffic analysis for the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-2.

P-94-3

This comment states an opinion that DEIR 2005 did not adequately address the sewage needs of the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-3 and P-59-5.

P-94-4

This comment requests information about haul trucks during construction. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-4.

P-94-5

The comment summarizes the points raised in the comment letter. Please refer to responses to comments L-1-4, P-4-5, and Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-94-6

This comment concludes the comment letter. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

CARL SCHIERMEYER

P-95-1

The comment supports approval of the proposed project because he believes it would be a net visual improvement to the community and the City's revenue base. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-95-2

The commenter does not believe cut through traffic in Bixby Village will occur and that outside of peak hours the surrounding roadway system should be able to handle the increase of traffic from the project site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. Potential project impacts related to traffic and circulation were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Please refer to DEIR 2005 for additional information.

P-95-3

The comment supports approval of the proposed project because the project applicant has made an effort to meet the open space requirements in SEADIP. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

DON SCHUBERT

P-96-1

The comment states that DEIR 2005 has problems because it did not include a description of the physical conditions on Loynes Drive. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-96-2

The comment states that DEIR 2005 did not include Seaport Marina in the cumulative analysis, and that University Park Estates will be affected by cut-through traffic. Please refer to Common Response 2: Seaport Marina and Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-96-3

The commenter is concerned about air quality impacts. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. Potential project impacts related to air quality were evaluated in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005.

P-96-4

The commenter is concerned about the proposed project using existing sewer lines. Please refer to Response to Comment P-59-5.

P-96-5

The commenter is concerned about possible increases in crime. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-10. Potential impacts to police services were evaluated in Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005. In addition, the public services and utilities analysis was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-96-6

The commenter supports developing the project site as a technical and professional office complex or a public storage facility. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

DON AND PAM SCHUBERT

P-97-1

The comment consists of an introduction to the comment letter. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-1.

P-97-2

The comment erroneously states that five intersections were evaluated in the traffic analysis for the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-2.

P-97-3

This comment states an opinion that DEIR 2005 did not adequately address the sewage needs of the proposed project. Please refer to Responses to Comments P-4-3 and P-59-5.

P-97-4

This comment requests information about haul trucks during construction. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-4.

P-97-5

The comment summarizes the points raised in the comment letter. Please refer to Responses to Comments L-1-4, P-4-5, and Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-97-6

This comment concludes the comment letter. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

JOHN AND CONSTANCE SHAINLINE

P-98-1

The commenters are opposes to the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-98-2

The comment states that Loynes cannot handle additional traffic due to its physical characteristics. Please refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-98-3

The commenters are concerned that the significant unavoidable impacts of the proposed project will make University Park Estates a less desirable living area. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

M. DESIGLIN

P-99-1

The comment consists of an introduction to the comment letter. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-1.

P-99-2

The comment erroneously states that five intersections were evaluated in the traffic analysis for the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-2.

P-99-3

This comment states an opinion that DEIR 2005 did not adequately address the sewage needs of the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-3 and P-59-5.

P-99-4

This comment requests information about haul trucks during construction. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-4.

P-99-5

The comment summarizes the points raised in the comment letter. Please refer to responses to comments L-1-4, P-4-5, and Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-99-6

This comment concludes the comment letter. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

ANGELA SIMONELLI

P-100-1

The comment suggests constructing a sidewalk from 2nd Street to Anaheim Road. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

CYNTHIA SKOLL

P-101-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project and erroneously states that the traffic study for the proposed project was begun after the school year ended. As stated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005, traffic counts were conducted for 24-hour periods by Southland Car Counters in January 2004 (weekday) and July 2004 (weekend). The analysis presented in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 was based on the Traffic Impact Analysis completed in January 2005. For additional information refer to Appendix J of DEIR 2005. Please also see Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-101-2

The comment states that the proposed Seaport Marina project was not included in the cumulative impact analysis for the proposed Home Depot project. Refer to Common Response 2: Seaport Marina.

P-101-3

The commenter does not want additional pollution of any kind. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-101-4

The commenter is concerned about the state of the existing sewer lines. Please refer to Response to Comment P-59-5.

P-101-5

The commenter is concerned about potential noise impacts. Potential noise impacts associated with the proposed project were evaluated in Section 4.9 of DEIR 2005. As stated in DEIR 2005, implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.9.1 and 4.9.2 will reduce potential project impacts related to traffic noise and construction noise to a less than significant level. All other potential project impacts related to noise are less than significant.

P-101-6

The commenter opposes the proposed project and suggests a storage facility or a small professional complex. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

PERRY SKOLL

P-102-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-102-2

The commenter is concerned about possible increases in traffic in the project area. Please refer to Response to Comment P-11-1.

P-102-3

The commenter is concerned about possible increases in crime related to the presence of day-laborers. Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-10

P-102-4

The comment erroneously states that the traffic study was begin after the end of the school year and that the project will contribute to cut-through traffic in University Park Estates. Please refer to Response to Comment P-101-1.

P-102-5

The comment states that the proposed Seaport Marina project was not included in the cumulative impact analysis for the proposed Home Depot project. Refer to Common Response 2: Seaport Marina.

P-102-6

The comment states that tax revenue generated by the proposed project will be offset by demand for additional public services. Potential impacts to police, fire, and other public services were evaluated in Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005. With the exception of possible impacts related to the provision of solid waste disposal capacity in Los Angeles County, all other potential impacts associated with the proposed project are less than significant and do not require mitigation. Please note that the public service and utility analysis was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-102-7

The commenter does not want the University Park Estates neighborhood to change. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-102-8

The commenter does not want additional air pollution from traffic. Potential air quality impacts were evaluated in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-102-9

The commenter is concerned about the state of the existing sewer lines. Please refer to Response to Comment P-59-5.

P-102-10

The commenter is concerned about potential noise impacts. Please refer to Response to Comment P-101-5.

P-102-11

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project and suggests a storage facility or 2-story concrete tilt up complex. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

JOE SOPO

P-103-1

The comment states that the on and off ramps for SR-22 at Studebaker need to be widened prior to the start of construction on the proposed project. As stated in DEIR 2005, and in the cumulative analysis of potential traffic impacts for the proposed Home Depot and Seaport Marina projects in the Recirculated Draft EIR, improvements to Studebaker Road/SR-22 westbound and eastbound ramps would require potential encroachment into the Los Cerritos Channel immediately adjacent and parallel to Studebaker Road. In addition, Caltrans has no plans to improve this facility. Please refer to DEIR 2005 and the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-103-2

The comment states that the proposed Seaport Marina project should be included in the cumulative analysis for the proposed Home Depot project. Refer to Common Response 2: Seaport Marina.

SHARON SOZA

P-104-1

The comment states that the purpose of the comment period is to “sate the masses.” CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines require public review of draft EIRs and set forth mandatory time periods for that review. DEIR 2005 was circulated for a 45-day comment period pursuant to PRC Section 21091(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15105(a) and 15205(c).

P-104-2

The commenter is concerned about potential traffic impacts associated with the proposed project. Potential traffic impacts associated with the proposed project were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Please refer to Response to Comment P-11-1 or DEIR 2005 for additional information.

BEVERLY SPICER

P-105-1

The commenter is opposed to the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-105-2

The commenter is concerned about the potential traffic impacts of the proposed project and states that Loynes Drive is hazardous. Potential traffic impacts associated with the proposed project were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Please refer to DEIR 2005 and to Responses to Comments P-11-1 and Common Response 2: Seaport Marina.

P-105-3

The commenter is concerned about the potential for the proposed project to attract day laborers. Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-10.

P-105-4

The commenter is concerned about the proposed project's possible impacts on the Los Cerritos Wetlands, increased air pollution, impacts to the local sewer system, and potential hazardous waste impacts.

Potential impacts to the Los Cerritos Wetlands were evaluated in Section 4.3 of DEIR 2005. As stated on page 4.3-9, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse effects to the Los Cerritos Wetlands from project sources such as traffic, light, and noise. These sources already exist and are not expected to increase substantially.

Potential air quality impacts were analyzed in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. Please refer to DEIR 2005 for additional information.

Please refer to Response to Comment P-59-5 for additional information about proposed improvements to the local sewer system. Please also refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information related to sewer services.

Potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous waste were evaluated in Section 4.6 of DEIR 2005. The hazards and hazardous materials analysis was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-105-5

The commenter requests denial of the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

RICHARD AND JEANNE STAFFORD

P-106-1

The comment states that Loynes Drive is congested and dangerous in its existing condition. Please refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-106-2

The comment questions the need for the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

CHRISTOPHER STILES

P-107-1

The commenters are concerned about the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-107-2

The comment states that the proposed project will contribute to existing traffic congestion and increase fatal accidents on Loynes. The potential traffic impacts of the proposed project were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. In addition, the traffic and circulation analysis was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR and the Common Response 1: Loynes Drive for additional information.

P-107-3

The comment states that the proposed project will result in air quality impacts. Please refer to Response to Comment P-22-5 for additional information.

P-107-4

The commenters are concerned about possible cut-through traffic in the University Park Estates Neighborhood. Please refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-107-5

The comment states that impacts associated with the proposed Seaport Marina were not analyzed. The proposed Seaport Marina project will undergo separate CEQA analysis. Please also refer to Common Response 2: Seaport Marina.

P-107-6

The comment states that the proposed project will result in air quality impacts. Please refer to Response to Comment P-22-5 for additional information.

P-107-7

The comment states that the sewage plan outlined in DEIR 2005 is inadequate. Please refer to Response to Comment P-59-5.

P-107-8

The comment states that the proposed project is not consistent with the City's 2010 Strategic Plan because it will be low wage jobs to Long Beach. Consistency with the Strategic Plan 2010 was evaluated in Section 4.8 of DEIR 2005. The proposed project is consistent with the Strategic Plan because it will directly contribute to business development, job creation, the revitalization of aging

areas, and infill development. The proposed project is also consistent with the Strategic Plan and will further the City's effort to preserve and enhance industrial opportunities in the area by providing support services for industries and employees.

P-107-9

The commenters oppose approval of the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

MARY SUTTIE

P-108-1

The comment requests that all applicable rights of appeal be reserved. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

MICHELLE SZTRAICHER

P-109-1

The commenter is concerned about the proposed project being located close to an elementary school because she believes the project may result in danger to children because of increased air pollution, traffic, and possible transient workers in Channel View Park. The comment is not substantiated with any facts or additional information. Potential impacts related to air quality were evaluated in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. Potential impacts relate to traffic and circulation were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Potential impacts related to police services (law enforcement) were evaluated in Section 4.10 of the Recirculated Draft EIR.

P-109-2

The comment states that the proposed Seaport Marina project was omitted from the traffic study include in DEIR 2005. Refer to Common Response 2: Seaport Marina.

P-109-3

The comment states that DEIR 2005 claims that the University Park Estates neighborhood will not be impacted by cut-through traffic. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-109-4

The comment erroneously states that the cut-through traffic analysis was begun the second week of June in 2005. Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-4.

P-109-5

The comment states that motorist will cut through University Park Estates and Bixby Village Drive. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-109-6

This comment states that the EIR finds that there would be a significant increase in weekend traffic. Please refer to Response to Comment. O-3-6.

P-109-7

The comment states that the proposed hours of operation will attract contractors. Please refer to Response to Comment P-88-3.

P-109-8

The comment states that the proposed project will attract itinerant workers. Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-10.

P-109-9

The comment states that the project will impact plant and animals and that the Los Cerritos Channel does support wetlands. Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-11.

P-109-10

The comment states that the proposed project requires a local coastal development permit and a Coastal Commission hearing. Please refer to Response to Comment O-1-23.

SUSAN TAYLOR

P-110-1

The comment states that Studebaker Road and Loynes Drive are unstable and that increased traffic from the proposed project will contribute to worsening physical conditions. The comment implies that the cost to maintain Loynes Drive will exceed tax revenue from the project site. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive. This is not a comment on DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein. No further response is necessary.

P-110-2

The comment states that air quality impacts will affect children at Kettering Elementary. Potential air quality impacts were evaluated in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. Please refer to DEIR 2005 for additional information regarding air quality impacts and potential health impacts associated with major criteria air pollutants.

P-110-3

Refer to Common Response 4: Threat of Terrorist Attack.

P-110-4

The comment states that increased traffic, 24-hour lighting, and potential sewage spills will affect all living things. Potential traffic impacts were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005.

As stated in Section 4.1 of DEIR 2005, photometric analysis of project lighting available for review at the City of Long Beach Department of Planning and Building shows that spill light is reduced to a maximum of 0.3 fc at 50 feet from the project boundary and a maximum of 0.1 fc at 100 feet from the project boundary. Mitigation Measures 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 are precautionary measures intended to further prevent any potentially adverse impacts from spill light or glare. With incorporation of these measures, any potentially significant impacts from spill light and glare generated by the proposed project are reduced to below a level of significance.

Potential impacts regarding the sewer line extension were evaluated in Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005. The proposed sewer line extension under the Loy

The proposed sewer pipe across Los Cerritos Channel will be double-walled to contain any leaks that might occur in the primary pipe. A leak detection system will be installed to detect any leaks in the primary pipe. If a leak is detected, the system will send an alarm notification indicating that repair is needed. This is not a significant unavoidable impact of the proposed project. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-110-5

The comment states that significant unavoidable impacts will result in ongoing problems not factored into the estimated tax revenue for the proposed project. However, the non-terrorist security risk issues brought up by the commenter in Comments P-110-1 through P-110-4 have been substantially mitigated by improvements to be funded by the project applicant. As a general rule, an EIR is

required to evaluate only the environment impacts of a project, and economic effects that are not related to physical impacts need not be evaluated in an EIR. Furthermore, municipal funding of roadway repair is not an environmental issue required to be addressed in an EIR. The comment does not contain any data or new information related to substantive environmental issues or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

ROBERTA THOMAS

P-111-1

The commenter opposes the location of the proposed project due to the physical characteristics of Loynes Drive. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-111-2

The comment states that the proposed project will impact wetlands. Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-11.

P-111-3

The comment states that the project may disturb a “toxic waste dump.” The project site is not located on a dump site. Refer to Response to Comment O-7-9.

P-111-4

The comment states that some residents in the Belmont Shores Mobile Estates are thinking of moving because of potential impacts to their quality of life and wildlife resulting from project implementation. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-111-5

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

WILLIAM THOMAS

P-112-1

The commenter does not anticipate any additional traffic impacts for the Alamitos Heights residents. Potential impacts relate to traffic and circulation were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Please refer to DEIR 2005 for additional information.

P-112-2

The comment states that the synchronization of stop lights would be beneficial. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-112-3

The comment states that the location of the Home Depot Design Center would be a benefit to the project area. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-112-4

The comment questions the design of bike paths along Loynes Drive. Specifically, the comment questions whether parking will be made available on Loynes and suggests additional improvements to the bike paths in the project area.

The proposed project includes design and construction of pedestrian access across the Loynes Drive Bridge west of Studebaker Road. This will provide convenient accessible, (i.e., ADA) pedestrian access from the adjacent residential area to the proposed neighborhood shops and restaurants.

P-112-5

The commenter would like to see the final plans for bike paths in the area and states that the proposed project would provide a benefit for all residents in the area. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

JOHN TOOHI

P-113-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project because of its potential traffic and air quality impacts. Potential traffic impacts were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Potential air quality impacts were evaluated in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-113-2

The comment requests clarification of the Long-term microscale analysis presented in Section 4.2 of DEIR 2005. The text listing 9.7 and 5.7 ppm is in error; they should match Table D and say 5.8 and 4.7 ppm. This correction will be made in the Final EIR.

P-113-3

The comment states that 5.5 ppm is the second highest 1-hour CO concentration, not 5.9 pp, as used in the air quality analysis in Section 4.2. Table D only shows the highest value for each year. The second highest value for each year can be verified on the EPA website:
www.epa.gov/air/data/monvalsl.html.

P-113-4

The comment states that references provided in Chapter 11 of DEIR 2005 were difficult to correlate to the text because several reports were prepared by the same consulting firm. In addition to internal citations, each topic section in Chapter 4.0 contains an introduction that lists the technical reports upon which the analysis is based. Clarification of reference materials has been made in the Recirculated Draft EIR.

P-113-5

The comment states that general website addresses are given as references for very specific information making it difficult locate where the information was obtained. The complete website addresses are provided below.

ARB: www.arb.ca.gov/adam/welcome.html

EPA: www.epa.gov/air/data/index.html

P-113-6

The comment concludes the comment letter and request that the commenter be added to the project mailing list. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

PATRICIA TOWNER

P-114-1

The commenter is concerned about the proposed project and states that the project site should have been more thoroughly considered during the land use planning process for the Long Beach coastal zone. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-114-2

The comment states the Long Beach has clean air and the project should not be approved because it will result in significant adverse air quality impacts. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-114-3

The comment erroneously states that the project will have 24 hour operations that will impact residents and area wildlife through the creation of light and glare. The comment also erroneously states that nighttime operations were found to be a significant construction impact. The hours of operation for the proposed project are from 5:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. on Saturday, and 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. on Sunday. As stated in Mitigation Measure 4.9.2, construction will be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and on federal holidays; and 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays. In accordance with the City of Long Beach's standards, no construction activities are permitted outside of these hours, and no construction is permitted on Sundays without a special work permit.

Potential impacts related to light and glare were evaluated in Section 4.1 of DEIR 2005. Photometric analysis of project lighting available for review at the City of Long Beach Department of Planning and Building shows that spill light is reduced to a maximum of 0.3 fc at 50 feet from the project boundary and a maximum of 0.1 fc at 100 feet from the project boundary. Mitigation Measures 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 are precautionary measures intended to further prevent any potentially adverse impacts from spill light or glare. With incorporation of these measures, any potentially significant impacts from spill light and glare generated by the proposed project are reduced to below a level of significance.

P-114-4

The commenter believes that Edison has an obligation to the community to maintain the character of the neighborhood and that the proposed project site should be rezoned residential or light commercial. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-114-5

The commenter disagrees with the thresholds used to determine significant air quality impacts. Specific criteria for determining whether the potential air quality impacts of a project are significant

are set forth in the SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. These criteria were used in DEIR 2005 and the Recirculated Draft EIR to evaluate the potential air quality impacts of the proposed project. The criteria include daily emissions thresholds, compliance with State and national air quality standards, and consistency with the current AQMP. A summary of these thresholds, which were used in this document to determine whether or not a significant impact will occur, is provided in DEIR 2005 and the Recirculated Draft EIR.

P-114-6

The comment questions why pollutants were not measured on 7th Street. Ambient air quality data representative of the project area were obtained at the North Long Beach Air Quality Monitoring Station at 3648 N. Long Beach Blvd. which is operated by the ARB/SCAQMD. The EIR analyzes the potential air quality impacts of adding the proposed project to the area with computer modeling to predict the emission levels and their potential effects on air quality, both on a regional and a local basis.

P-114-7

The comment states that an assumption was made that most construction traffic would arrive at the project site and leave the project site via Studebaker and SR-22. The commenter disagrees with this assumption and believes construction traffic will cut-through the neighborhood. As stated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005, implementation of a construction management plan would be required to minimize traffic impacts to the local circulation system in the area. The plan will identify the routes that construction vehicles will use to access the site, the hours of construction traffic, traffic controls and detours, off-site vehicle staging areas, and parking areas for the project. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.11.1, construction traffic impacts associated with implementation of the project would be less than significant. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic

P-114-8

The comment does not believe that noise monitoring conducted for DEIR 2005 is reflective of the kinds of noises the area experiences on a continuous basis. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The primary purpose of the noise monitoring conducted for the proposed project was to establish the existing noise levels within the project area. An additional measurement was conducted off-site, within the Channel View Park, to establish the existing ambient background noise levels. The purpose of this noise monitoring was not to measure the existing traffic noise levels within the residential development.

P-114-9

The comment states that the project area is subject to noise from aircraft associated with Long Beach Airport and release of steam from the power plants and that increasing noise levels will be detrimental to residents and the environment. Potential noise impacts were evaluated using the criteria in the Noise Element of the City of Long Beach General Plan and the City's Municipal Code Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.9.1 and 4.9.2 will reduce potential project impacts related to traffic noise and construction noise to a less than significant level. All other potential project impacts related to noise are less than significant. The proposed project would not alter the number of

flights or the flight path of aircraft using the nearby Long Beach airport. In addition, the proposed project would not alter the operation of the existing Edison plant. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase the duration or number of noise events emanating from these sources.

The long-term traffic and stationary source noise impacts of the proposed project have been evaluated in detail within Section 4.9 of DEIR 2005. The proposed project would not result in any long-term off-site noise impacts.

P-114-10

The commenter does not believe the project area should be impacted by the proposed project given existing traffic conditions. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-114-11

The commenter believes that improvements to Loynes will encourage people to use Loynes instead of 7th Street. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-114-12

The comment states that development of the Bixby Wetlands Site was not considered in the project analysis. This proposed project was denied by the California Coastal Commission in the mid-1980s. As such, it cannot be considered a reasonably foreseeable project and does not need to be included in the cumulative analysis found in the EIR.

The comment also questions the inclusion of a proposed project located at 120 Studebaker. The 120 Studebaker Road development considers the development of a 60,650-square-foot shopping center located at the intersection of PCH/Studebaker Road, south of the project site. Traffic generated by the 120 Studebaker Road project was assigned to the local streets manually using trip distribution assumptions similar to the proposed project.

P-114-13

The commenter suggests opening Studebaker Road to PCH and states that use of property south of 2nd street should have been analyzed because it has been the subject of proposed commercial projects. None of these areas have currently proposed or permitted projects. As such, they cannot be considered reasonably foreseeable projects and do not need to be included in the cumulative analysis found in the EIR.

P-114-14

The comment states that Seaport Marina should have been included in the analysis. Refer to Common Response 2: Seaport Marina.

P-114-15

The comment concludes the comment letter and recommends that citizen input is useful in development decisions. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

SUSAN TOWNSEND

P-115-1

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project because of the potential impacts to the neighborhood and impacts related to traffic. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

MARTYN TRAVERS

P-116-1

The commenter opposes the proposed project because of potential traffic impacts. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-116-2

The comment states that the project will result in increased traffic on Colorado Avenue. The study area for traffic impacts was developed by the City Traffic Engineer based on local and regional access roadways to the project site. Colorado Avenue was not included in the study area because it was determined vehicles accessing the project site from the west would use major roadways such as 2nd Street, 7th Street and PCH.

P-116-3

The comment states that the proposed project will increase traffic using the westbound off ramp from SR-22 to Studebaker. As stated in DEIR 2005, the proposed project will have a significant unavoidable impact to the Studebaker Road/SR-22 westbound ramps. Please refer to DEIR 2005 for additional information.

P-116-4

The comment states that the project will result in additional truck traffic on local streets. Truck traffic is considered in the traffic analysis for the proposed project. Please note, that Loynes Drive is not a truck route. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR and Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-116-5

The commenter believes that the DEIR omitted information related to potential traffic impacts. Traffic impacts associated with the proposed project were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. The analysis in DEIR 2005 is complete and thorough and fully characterized potential effects related to traffic and circulation. Without new data or information presented in the comment, no further response is necessary. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA analysis will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

RIC TRENT

P-117-1

The comment was a letter sent to the Los Cerritos Wetlands Study Group requesting their review of a draft comment letter on DEIR 2005. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

RIC TRENT

P-118-1

The comment requests that the proposed project be held in temporary abeyance until a new, comprehensive plan for the area around the Los Cerritos Wetlands is created. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-118-2

The comment states that more in-depth analysis of potential impacts related to soil contamination, air pollution, sewage disposal, and traffic needs to be completed. Portions of DEIR 2005 were revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006 including the hazards analysis and public service and utilities analysis. The Recirculated Draft EIR also includes cumulative traffic, air quality, and noise analysis of the proposed Home Depot and Seaport Marina projects. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-118-3

The comment requests that the right of appeal be reserved for the Los Cerritos Wetlands Study Group. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

JANET VERNON

P-119-1

The comment is introductory and states that the commenter agrees with points made in the letter submitted by Angela Bailey McCord. Please see responses to comment letters P-78, P-79A, and P-79B. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-119-2

The commenter is concerned about traffic related to the proposed project and the proposed project at PCH and 2nd Street. The commenter is also concerned about potential impacts to the Los Cerritos Wetlands. Potential traffic impacts associated with the proposed project were analyzed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005, and as stated, the project would result in a significant unavoidable impact to the intersection of PCH and 2nd Street. Potential impacts to the Los Cerritos Wetlands were evaluated in Section 4.3 of DEIR 2005. As stated in DEIR 2005, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse effects to the Los Cerritos Wetlands from project sources such as traffic, light, and noise. These sources already exist and are not expected to increase substantially. Please also refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive and Common Response 2: Seaport Marina.

KATHLEEN, SARAH, AND CHARLES WARD

P-120-1

The commenters oppose the proposed project because of potential traffic impacts. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. Potential traffic impacts associated with the proposed project were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. The traffic and circulation was also revised and recirculated for public review. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-120-2

The commenters believe that the proposed project will force Seal Beach Hardware and Billing Hardware out of business. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the environmental analysis therein and, no further response is necessary. Potential private business effects on two businesses in the City of Seal Beach are beyond the purview of the EIR and are not effects required to be analyzed by CEQA.

P-120-3

The commenters question the need for the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary

KRISTEN WARNICK

P-121-1

The comment consists of an introduction to the comment letter. The commenters oppose the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA process will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-121-2

The comment erroneously states that five intersections were evaluated in the traffic analysis for the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-2.

P-121-3

This comment states an opinion that DEIR 2005 did not adequately address the sewage needs of the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-3.

P-121-4

This comment requests information about haul trucks during construction. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-4.

P-121-5

The comment summarizes the points raised in the comment letter. The commenters oppose the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-5.

P-121-6

This comment concludes the comment letter. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

RUSSELL WARNICK

P-122-1

The comment consists of an introduction to the comment letter. The commenters oppose the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA process will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-122-2

The comment erroneously states that five intersections were evaluated in the traffic analysis for the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-2.

P-122-3

This comment states an opinion that DEIR 2005 did not adequately address the sewage needs of the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-3.

P-122-4

This comment requests information about haul trucks during construction. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-4.

P-122-5

The comment summarizes the points raised in the comment letter. The commenters oppose the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-5.

P-122-6

This comment concludes the comment letter. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

PATRICIA AND RICHARD WEEKS

P-123-1

The commenters object to the analysis contained in DEIR 2005. Portions of DEIR 2005 were revised and recirculated for public review. Please refer the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA analysis will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-123-2

The commenter disagrees with the conclusion in the EIR stating that the proposed project will have a less than significant impacts on the Los Cerritos Wetlands. The project site is currently developed with industrial uses and is separated from the Los Cerritos wetlands by a major arterial (Studebaker Road). Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse effects to the Los Cerritos Wetlands from project sources such as traffic, light, and noise. These sources already exist and are not expected to increase substantially. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required. DEIR 2005 does include mitigation to prevent any incidental discharge of fill, debris, or other material into the Los Cerritos Channel and the two adjacent water supply channels.

P-123-3

The commenter is concerned about possible cut-through traffic. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-123-4

The comment states that the project will affect wetlands, traffic, and existing residential and commercial developments and suggests that a better alternative can be found. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA analysis will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

MARIA AND JOHN WYATT

P-124-1

The comment states that DEIR 2005 ignored that Loynes Drive is a low level collector street and potential impacts to residents on Vista Street. On page 4.11-3 of DEIR 2005, Loynes Drive is identified as a four-lane east-west roadway located west of the project site that is classified as a Collector Street.

P-124-2

The comment states that the proposed Seaport Marina project was not included in the cumulative analysis for the proposed project. Refer to Common Response 2: Seaport Marina.

P-124-3

The comment disagrees with the analysis of cut-through traffic presented in DEIR 2005. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-124-4

This comment states that the EIR finds that there would be a significant increase in weekend-traffic. DEIR 2005 stated that there would be a significant unavoidable impact at two intersections during the weekend peak hour: PCH/2nd Street and PCH/7th Street.

P-124-5

Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-7 and O-3-8.

P-124-6

The comment states that the proposed hours of operation will attract contractors and the proposed project will generally attract day laborers. Please refer to responses to comments O-3-9 and O-3-10.

P-124-7

This comment disagrees with the analysis of biological impacts presented in DEIR 2005 and states that the project will require a local coastal development permit. Please refer to responses to comments O-3-11, O-1-23, and O-3-12.

P-124-8

The comment erroneously states that the proposed project will be using existing sewer lines that are beyond 100 percent capacity. Please refer to responses to comments L-1-4, L-1-5, and P-59-5.

P-124-9

The comment states that tax revenue is overstated because it will be off-set by additional calls for public services (e.g., police, fire). Please refer to responses to comments P-8-13 and P-32-5.

P-124-10

The comment suggests that a technical and professional office complex would be a more appropriate use of the project site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-124-11

The comment suggests that a public storage facility would be a more appropriate use of the project site. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

GAIL YAKSITCH

P-125-1

The commenters are opposed to the proposed project because of possible traffic impacts to Studebaker Road. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

ROBERT YASSIN

P-126-1

The comment questions the need for the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and alternatives to the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-126-2

The commenters are concerned about traffic impacts to 2nd Street and PCH and the Belmont Shores area. Potential traffic impacts were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. DEIR 2005 found that the proposed project would result in a significant unavoidable weekend midday peak hour impact to the intersection of 2nd Street and PCH.

JULIE ZIEG

P-127-1

The comment consists of an introduction to the comment letter. The commenters oppose the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA process will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-127-2

The comment erroneously states that five intersections were evaluated in the traffic analysis for the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-2.

P-127-3

This comment states an opinion that DEIR 2005 did not adequately address the sewage needs of the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-3.

P-127-4

This comment requests information about haul trucks during construction. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-4.

P-127-5

The comment summarizes the points raised in the comment letter. The commenters oppose the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comment P-4-5.

P-127-6

This comment concludes the comment letter. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

NANCY AND LARRY KELLISON

P-128-1

This comment is introductory in nature and states that the commenter opposes the project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA process will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-128-2

This comment states that existing traffic in the project area is already congested and that the proposed project will add new traffic. Potential impacts related to traffic and circulation were analyzed in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 and potential cumulative traffic, air quality, and noise impacts related to the proposed Home Depot and Seaport Marina projects were analyzed in the Recirculated Draft EIR. As stated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 and the Recirculated Draft EIR, even with implementation of these mitigation measures, the proposed project will result in significant impacts to the following intersections:

Weekday Peak Hour

- Studebaker Road/SR-22 westbound ramps
- Studebaker Road/SR-22 eastbound ramps (with Seaport Marina added)

Weekend Midday Peak Hour

- PCH/7th Street
- PCH/2nd Street

Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information related to the cumulative traffic analysis.

P-128-3

The comment questions the type of business planned for this area and states that the City could have found a more environmentally appealing project. DEIR 2005 provides an analysis of alternatives for the project site consistent with CEQA Guidelines. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA process will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-128-4

This comment expresses concern regarding removal of the current storage tanks and potential fumes, dust and noise. Procedures for tank removal were provided in DEIR 2005 and the Recirculated Draft EIR. Refer to Responses to Comments S-6-2, S-6-3, O-7-6.

P-128-5

The comment suggests that approval of the project has been completed without public input. The project is undergoing CEQA compliance at this time. At the August 17, 2006 meeting, the Planning Commission will consider the Final EIR for certification and will consider the project for approval. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA process will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

PUBLIC COMMENTS TAKEN AT PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION (MAY 19, 2005)

P-129-1 (C. J. Hentzen)

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project because of potential impacts to wildlife, and in particular Canada geese. The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project because of potential impacts to wildlife, and in particular the Canada goose. The Canada goose (*Branta canadensis*) is common throughout North America and frequently visits man-made areas, particularly near water ways, that are open and grassy, such as golf courses, agricultural land, airports, and parks. The Canada goose is not State or federally listed as rare, threatened or endangered and construction of the project will not result in a loss of habitat for this species. In fact, the project will improve the disturbed conditions on the project site. While the Canada goose may pass through or forage in the project area, there is a low probability for the Canada goose to nest in the project area due to its lack of grassy and marshy areas. Nesting migratory birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Preconstruction surveys of the site will identify any nesting migratory birds and construction activity will be modified to avoid disturbance or destruction of active nests until the young have fledged. With implementation of this measure, migratory birds, such as the Canada goose, will not be adversely affected by the project. Please refer to the Biological Resources section of the EIR for more specific information regarding potential wildlife impacts and proposed mitigation.

P-129-2 (Janice Dahl)

The commenter, speaking in front of the Planning Commission, said there were flaws in the DEIR 2005 and provided letters of residents opposed to the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and DEIR 2005 will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-129-3

The comment states that proposed hours of operation may attract contractors. Please refer to Responses to Comments O-3-9, P-73-4, and P-88-3.

P-129-4

The comment states that the neighborhood is concerned about transient workers. Please refer to Response to Comment O-3-10.

P-129-5

The comment states that Loynes Drive was not intended for use as an access street to the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-129-6

The comment states that residents on Vista Street will have the enjoyment of their properties destroyed by traffic and pollution from the proposed project. Potential air quality and traffic impacts were evaluated in DEIR 2005 and the analysis was revised and recirculated for public review. Please

refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-129-7

The comment claims that Home Depot implied that that significant air quality impacts are acceptable and states that Long Beach is already rated as one of the top cities in the nation where causes of death are related to asthma. Please refer to Responses to Comments O-3-7, O-3-8, P-1-16, and P-1-17.

P-129-8

The comment states that the proposed project does not meet the 30 percent open space requirement. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information related to open space on the project site. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-129-9

The comment states that the existing sewer system is over capacity. Please refer to responses to comments L-1-4, L-1-5, and P-59-5.

P-129-10

The comment states that tax revenue generated by the proposed project will be offset by demand for additional public services. Please refer to Response to Comment P-102-6.

P-129-11 (Ann Dennison)

The comment misquotes a portion of the Biological Resources Report for the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comment P-40-2.

P-129-12

The comment states that the proposed project requires an LCP and warrants additional review by the California Coastal Commission. Please refer to Response to Comment O-1-23 and P-88-11.

P-129-13

The comment states that 7th Street is already impacted by traffic and that the proposed expansion of Cornerstone Church should have been included in the cumulative analysis. The cumulative projects that were projected to be completed at the same time as the proposed project were provided by the City. The cumulative project list was based on applications submitted to the City for review. The Cornerstone Church was not on this list

P-129-14

The commenter disagrees that traffic signal coordination will mitigate project impacts. Traffic signal coordination is included in the proposed project as a design feature but it is not suggested mitigation for a specific project impact. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-129-15

The comment suggested that the proposed project's proximity to the electrical generating stations will increase risk of terrorist strikes. Refer to Common Response 4: Threat of Terrorist Attack.

P-129-16

The comment states that Loynes Drive floods and prevents access. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-129-17

The commenter suggests that the project process should have been stopped because of potential Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or the project development process will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-129-18

The commenter disagrees with the analysis of potential impacts to the Los Cerritos Wetlands presented in DEIR 2005. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or the CEQA analysis will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-129-19

The comment states that widening 2nd Street at the end of Studebaker Road will require expansion into the Los Cerritos Wetlands. The proposed project does not expand any street surfaces into the Los Cerritos Wetlands. Mitigation Measure 4.11.2 would require land from the northeast corner of Studebaker Road and 2nd Street.

P-129-20

The commenter opposes approval of the proposed project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project or the CEQA analysis will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-129-21 (Kristan Haitz)

The commenter is concerned about potential cut-through traffic. Refer to Common Response 3: Cut-Through Traffic.

P-129-22

The comment states that Seaport Marina should have been included in the cumulative analysis. Refer to Common Response 2: Seaport Marina.

P-129-23 (Angie McCord)

The commenter is concerned about the deterioration of Loynes and states that vehicular traffic using Loynes Drive will increase if the proposed project is implemented. Refer to Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-129-24

The comment suggests that the proposed Home Depot may generate more traffic because it will be a Design Center. As stated in the Traffic Impact Analysis for the proposed project, the daily and peak-hour trips for the proposed project were generated using trip rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation manual (7th Edition, 2003). The trip rates for home improvement superstore (Land Use Code 862), shopping center (Land Use Code 820), and sit-down restaurant (Land Use Code 932) were used to calculate the trips generated by the proposed project. The ITE trip generation rate for "home improvement superstores" is the appropriate land use code for the proposed Home Depot Design Center.

P-129-25

The commenter believes that the SR-22/Studebaker Road exit is impacted in the existing condition and states that traffic will get worse if the project is implemented. Potential impacts related to traffic were evaluated in Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005. Please refer to DEIR 2005 for additional information. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers.

P-129-26

The commenter does not believe additional restaurants are needed. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-129-27

The comment requests information about when the City collected the peak intersection turn volumes used in the traffic impact analysis. Weekday peak-hours counts at four intersections in the study area were taken in June and October 2003. The remaining counts were collected in February 2004, with the exception of the AES Driveway and Studebaker, which were taken in April 2004. The weekend

counts were taken on July 2005. All counts included peak-hour turn movement counts. Please refer to Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 for additional information.

P-129-28

The comment states that traffic counts taken in January will be substantially different than traffic counts taken in July and questions if summer baseline traffic was taken into account. Southland Car Counters collected weekday peak-hour intersection turn volumes in January 2004 and collected weekend peak-hour (midday) traffic counts in July 2004 to allow for a worst-case analysis of weekend peak-hour project impacts.

MARJORIE KIMBRELL

P-130-1

This comment is introductory and does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-130-2

This comment asserts that the proposed project would have a negative impact and air quality and traffic. Air quality and traffic impacts were analyzed in DEIR 2005 and mitigation measures were provided.

P-130-3

This comment requests the commenter's concerns to be passed on to the Planning Commission. . Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

LINDA WHEELER

P-131-1

Refer to Response to Comment P-4-1.

P-131-2

Refer to Response to Comment P-4-2.

P-131-3

Refer to Response to Comment P-4-3.

P-131-4

Refer to Response to Comment P-4-4.

P-131-5

Refer to Response to Comment P-4-5.

P-131-6

Refer to Response to Comment P-4-6.

ELAINE BECKER

P-132-1

Refer to Response to Comment P-4-1.

P-132-2

Refer to Response to comment P-4-2.

P-132-3

Refer to Response to Comment P-4-3.

P-132-4

Refer to Response to Comment P-4-4.

P-132-5

Refer to Response to Comment P-4-5.

P-132-6

Refer to Response to Comment P-4-6.

JANE THOMAS LOPEZ

P-133-1

Refer to Response to Comment P-4-1.

P-133-2

Refer to Response to comment P-4-2.

P-133-3

Refer to Response to Comment P-4-3.

P-133-4

Refer to Response to Comment P-4-4.

P-133-5

Refer to Response to Comment P-4-5.

P-133-6

Refer to Response to Comment P-4-6.

CLARA L. DRUZGALSKI

P-134-1

This comment states that the project is poorly suited for the area and would have negative repercussions. This comment also states that citizens opposed to the project are not opposed to other types of developments of the land. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-134-2

The comment expresses concern about the proposed project because of its proximity to ecologically important habitats. DEIR 2005 acknowledges the project site proximity to the Los Cerritos Wetlands, the San Gabriel River, and Los Cerritos Channel. DEIR 2005 also provides an analysis of potential impacts of the proposed project related to hydrology and water quality. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-134-3

This comment expresses concern about excess traffic resulting from the project and potential damage to the roadways from extra truck traffic. DEIR 2005 provides analysis of potential impacts of the proposed project related to traffic and circulation. A Traffic Impact Analysis was prepared for the project (Appendix J of DEIR 2005). Roadway maintenance is the responsibility of the City. Please refer to Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 for additional information as well as Common Response 1: Loynes Drive.

P-134-4

This comment expresses concern about trash generated by the proposed project clogging the nearby waterways. As discussed in DEIR 2005, City required good-housekeeping practices would be implemented at the site. In addition, each storm drain outfall will be equipped with a Continuous Deflection Separator (CDS) unit prior to discharge to the supply channels. The CDS units are designed to capture gross solids such as trash and debris. Refer to DEIR 2005 for further information.

P-134-5

The comment expresses concern about traffic control and safety. Section 4.11 of DEIR 2005 provides an analysis of potential impacts of the proposed project related to traffic and circulation. Security issues were addressed in Section 4.10, Public Services and Utilities in DEIR 2005. Refer to Response to Comment O-2-11. Please note that Section 4.10 of DEIR 2005 was revised and recirculated for public review on June 2, 2006. Please refer to the Recirculated Draft EIR for additional information.

P-134-6

This comment states that development on the site should be limited to small businesses. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision

makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

P-134-7

This comment states that there is not a need for the proposed project, and that the city would have to spend too much money to maintain the traffic, environmental, and safety conditions in the city.

Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

KATHY FISHKIN

P-135-1

This letter provides support for the project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

WHIT LATIMER

P-136-1

This letter provides support for the project. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

COLLEGE PARK WEST PETITION

P-137-1

This comment opposes the construction of the proposed project. This petition included signatures from 407 residents in College Park West opposed to the project. Only the first page of signatures is included as part of the Responses to Comments document, but the entire petition is on file at the City of Long Beach Department of Building and Planning. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA analysis will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.

STOP HOME DEPOT PETITION

P-138-1

This comment opposes the construction of the proposed project due to environmental impacts. This petition included signatures from 493 residents opposed to the project. Only the first page of signatures is included as part of the Responses to Comments document, but the entire petition is on file at the City of Long Beach Department of Building and Planning. Opinions expressed regarding the proposed project and the CEQA analysis will be made available for consideration by the decision makers. The comment does not contain any substantive statements or questions about DEIR 2005 or the analysis therein and, no further response is necessary.